



9.18.17.

Library of the Theological Seminary,  
PRINCETON, N. J.

Division.....I

Section.....?

TRL





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2016 with funding from  
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

<https://archive.org/details/princetontheolog1431arms>

# The Princeton Theological Review

JULY, 1916

## THE DIVINE MESSIAH IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

The question whether the Old Testament has any testimony to give as to the Deity of our Lord, when strictly taken, resolves itself into the question whether the Old Testament holds out the promise of a Divine Messiah. To gather the intimations of a multiplicity in the Divine unity which may be thought to be discoverable in the Old Testament,<sup>1</sup> has an important indeed, but, in the first instance at least,<sup>2</sup> only an indirect bearing on this precise question. It may render, it is true, the primary service of removing any antecedent presumption against the witness of the Old Testament to the Deity of the Messiah, which may be supposed to arise from the strict monadism of Old Testament monotheism. It is quite conceivable, however, that the Messiah might be thought to be Divine, and yet God not be conceived pluralistically. And certainly there is no reason why, in the delivery of doctrine, the Deity of the Messiah might not be taught before the multiplicity in the unity of the Godhead had been revealed. In the history of Christian

---

<sup>1</sup> As H. P. Liddon does in the former portion of the lecture in which he deals with the "Anticipations of Christ's Divinity in the Old Testament" (*The Divinity of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ*. Bampton Lectures for 1866. Ed. 4, 1869, pp. 41 ff.). Similarly E. W. Hengstenberg gives by far the greater part of his essay on "The Divinity of the Messiah in the Old Testament" (*Christology of the Old Testament*, 1829, E. T. of ed. 2, 1865, pp. 282-331),—namely from p. 284 on—to a discussion of the Angel of Jehovah.

<sup>2</sup> For such questions remain as, for example, whether the Angel of Jehovah be not identified in the Old Testament itself with the Messiah (Daniel, Malachi). So G. F. Oehler (art. "Messias" in Herzog's *Realencyc.*, p. 41; *Theol. des A. T.*, ii, pp. 144, 265; *The Theology of the Old Testament*, E. T. American ed., pp. 446, 528), A. Hilgenfeld, *Die jüdische Apokalyptik*, pp. 47 ff. Cf. E. Riehm, *Messianic Prophecy*, E. T. pp. 195, 282, who cites these references in order to oppose them.

doctrine the conviction of the Deity of Christ was the condition, not the result, of the formulation of the doctrine of the Trinity.

It cannot be said in any case, therefore, that the discovery of a Divine Messiah in the Old Testament is dependent on the discovery also in the Old Testament of intimations of multiplicity in the unity of the Godhead. The two things go together in the sense that the discovery of either would be a natural preparation for the discovery of the other; that it would supply a matrix into which the other would nicely fit; and would set over against it a correlative doctrine with which it would readily unite to form a rational system. The two doctrines, though interdependent and mutually supporting one another in the system of which they form parts, are nevertheless not so dependent on one another that one of them might not conceivably be true without the other, and certainly not so that one could not conceivably be taught before the other. It seems in every way best, therefore, when inquiring after Old Testament intimations of the Deity of Christ, to keep this inquiry distinct from the parallel inquiry into possible Old Testament intimations of the multiplex constitution of the Godhead.

It is quite clear, at the outset, that the writers of the New Testament and Christ Himself understood the Old Testament to recognize and to teach that the Messiah was to be of divine nature. For example, they without hesitation support their own assertions of the Deity of Christ by appeals to Old Testament passages in which they find the Deity of the Messiah afore-proclaimed. This habit may be observed, as well as anywhere else perhaps, in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews. There, the author, after having announced the exalted nature of the Son, as the effulgence of the glory and the very image of the substance of God, illustrates His superiority to the angels, the highest of creatures, by appealing to a series of Old Testament passages, in which a "more excellent name" than is

given to angels is shown to belong of right to Him. The exaltation of the Son to the right hand of the majesty on high, he says, is in accordance with the intrinsic dignity of His person as manifested in this "more excellent name". The "more excellent name" which he cites from the Old Testament is in the first instance none other than that of Son itself, whence we learn that when the Old Testament gives to the Messiah the designation of Son of God—or we would better say, when it ascribes Sonship to God to Him (for it is after this broader fashion that the author develops his theme)—it ascribes to Him, in the view of the author of this Epistle, a super-angelic dignity of person.<sup>3</sup> Of this Son, now, he goes on to say that, in contrast with the names of mere ministry given to the angels, there are ascribed to Him the supreme names of "God" and "Lord"; and with the names all the dignities and functions which they naturally connote. These great names of "God" and "Lord" are apparently not adduced as new names, additional to that of "Son", but as explications of the contents of that one "more excellent name"; and thus we are advised of the loftiness of the name of "Son" in the mind of this writer.<sup>4</sup> From this catena of passages we perceive, then, that in the view of this writer the Old Testament presents to our contemplation a Messiah who is not merely transcendent but sheerly Divine; to whom the great names of "Son of God", "God", "Lord" belong of right, and to whom are ascribed all the dignities, powers and functions which these great names suggest.

<sup>3</sup> This representation of the author, embodied in the sharp demand: "Unto which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art my son?" has given the commentators some trouble in view of the designation of the angels in the Old Testament as "Sons of God". The notes of A. B. Davidson and Franz Delitzsch may be profitably consulted. When G. Hollmann, *in loc.* pp. 204, 5, remarks: "There is meant not the mere name of son, which is used in the Old Testament, as of the people, the king, and others, so also of angels but *the name of Son*, which is described in verses 2 and 3, according to its contents and its peculiarity," he is right in the substance of the matter but hardly in form.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Lünemann (in Meyer, E. T. p. 33) on the passage.

The passages of Scripture relied upon by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews to make his point are, broadly speaking, derived from what we know as the Messianic Psalms. More particularly, his argument depends especially on citations from the Second, Forty-fifth, and Hundred-and-tenth Psalms. Except for an allusion in Rev. xix. 8 the Forty-fifth Psalm is not elsewhere cited in the New Testament. But the Second and Hundred-and-tenth seem to have been much in the minds, and passages from them much on the lips, of its writers. To the Second, the very term *Mcssiah*, Christ, as applied to our Lord, goes back, as well as His loftier designation of Son of God; and it is adduced with great reverence as the Old Testament basis of these titles not only by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews (i. 5; v. 5), but by the original apostles (Acts iv. 24-26) and by Paul (Acts xiii. 33) as reported in the Acts, while its language has supplied to the Book of Revelation its standing phrases for describing the completeness of our Lord's conquest of the world (Rev. ii. 27; xii. 5; xix. 15). It was the Hundred-and-tenth Psalm which first gave expression to the Session of the Messiah at the right-hand of God, and not only is it repeatedly referred to with reference to this great fact by the Epistle to the Hebrews (i. 13; v. 6; vii. 17-21; x. 13), but Paul adopts its language when speaking of the exaltation of Christ (1 Cor. xv. 25) and Peter, in his initial proclamation of the Gospel at Pentecost, employs it in proof that Jesus has been raised to the right-hand of God and made Lord of Salvation (Acts ii. 36-37). Even more to the point, Jesus Himself adduces it to confound His opponents, who, harping on the title "Son of David", had forgotten that David himself recognized this, his greater Son as also his Lord. "And Jesus answered and said, we read in Mark's narrative (xii. 35-37; cf. Mt. xxii. 45-46; Lk. xx. 41-44), "How say the Scribes that the Christ is the Son of David? David himself said in the Holy Spirit, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies the footstool of thy feet.

David himself calleth Him Lord; and whence then is He his Son?" We shall let Johannes Weiss tell us what this means. The Scribes, says he,<sup>5</sup> had built up a whole system of doctrine about the Messiah, and an important caption in it ran that He (according to the prophesy, for example, of Is. xi. 1) is (the present is timeless: He must be it: that is required by the doctrine) a descendant of David. "This declaration Jesus proves untenable, since David in his Psalm cx, inspired by the Holy Spirit, calls the Messiah his 'Lord', and, therefore, to put it bluntly, looks up to Him with religious veneration. . . . It follows from this that He must be a higher being than David himself. . . . Jesus accordingly shows here that his conception of the Messiah was different from the current political one. According to the Book of Daniel, and according to the convictions of the pious circle out of which the so-called Apocalypses came the Messiah comes down from heaven, 'the man on the clouds'. That Jesus also thought thus we have already seen." Johannes Weiss writes, of course, from his own point of view, which we do not share in many of its implications—as, for example, in the assumption that Jesus repudiates descent from David. He makes, however, the main matter perfectly clear. Jesus saw in the Hundred-and-tenth Psalms a reference to the transcendent Messiah in which He Himself believed.<sup>6</sup> In Jesus' view, therefore, the transcendent Messiah is already an object of Old Testament revelation.

What Jesus and the writers of the New Testament saw in the Messianic references of the Psalms, it is natural that those who share their view-point should also see in them. How the matter looks to one of the most searching exponents of the Scriptures that God has as yet given His church—we mean E. W. Hengstenberg—he sums up himself

<sup>5</sup> *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*,<sup>1</sup> I. p. 175.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. the discussion of the meaning of Jesus' question and comment, F. Godet in loc. Luke (E. T. II. pp. 251-4): and also J. A. Alexander on Mk. xii 37.

for us in a passage brief enough to quote in its entirety.<sup>7</sup> He has no difficulty in speaking directly of passages in the Psalms "which contain a reference to the superhuman nature of the Messiah;—passages," he adds,

"on which we must the less think of forcing another meaning as in the prophets (for example, in Is. ix, where even Hitzig is obliged to recognize it) there is found something unquestionably similar. Such indications [he continues] pervade all the Messianic Psalms; and quite naturally. For the more deeply the knowledge of human sinfulness, impotence and nothingness sunk into Israel (compare, for example, Ps. ciii. 14-16), the less could men remain satisfied with the thought of a merely human redeemer, who, according to the Israelitish manner of contemplation, could do extremely little. A human king (and all the strictly Messianic Psalms have to do with Messiah as king), even of the most glorious description, could never accomplish what the idea of the kingdom of God imperiously required, and what had been promised even in the first announcements respecting the Messiah, namely, the bringing the nations into obedience, blessing all the families of the earth, and acquiring the sovereignty of the world. In Psalm ii. 12, the Messiah is presented *simpliciter* as the Son of God, as He, confidence in whom brings salvation, whose wrath is perdition. In Psalm xlv. 6-7 He is named God, Elohim. In Psalm lxxii. 5, 7, 17, eternity of dominion is ascribed to Him. In Psalm cx. 1, He at last appears as the Lord of the community of saints and of David himself, sitting at the right-hand of the Almighty, and installed in the full enjoyment of Divine authority over heaven and earth.

That the state of the case may be fully before us, it will be useful to place by the side of this brief statement a somewhat more lengthy one, the tone of which very fairly represents the spirit of devout students of Scripture of the middle of last century. For a reason which will appear later, it seems to us to be an unusually instructive statement, to the entire compass of which it will repay us to give attention. We draw it from William Binnie's work on the Psalms:<sup>8</sup>

Respecting the Person of Christ, the testimony of the Psalms is copious and sufficiently distinct. For one thing, it is everywhere

<sup>7</sup> *Commentary on the Psalms*, E. T. III, appendix, p. lvi, in the essay "On the Doctrinal Matter of the Psalms", near the beginning.

<sup>8</sup> *The Psalms: Their History, Teachings and Use*. 1870, pp. 200 ff.

assumed that He is the Kinsman of His people. The Christ of the Old Testament is one who is to be born of the seed of *Abraham* and *family of David*. The modern Rationalists, in common with the unbelieving Jews of all ages, refuse to go further. They will not recognize in Him more than man, maintaining with great confidence that superhuman dignity is never attributed to the Messiah, either in the law, or the prophets, or the psalms. It would be strange indeed if the fact were so. The disciples were slow of heart to receive any truth that happened to lie out of the line of their prior expectations,—any truth of which the faithful who lived before the incarnation had had no presentiment; yet we know that they readily accepted the truth that Jesus was more than man. The Cross of Christ was long an offence to them. It was not without a long struggle that they were constrained to acknowledge the abrogation of the Mosaic law and the opening of the door of faith to the Gentiles. But there is no trace of any similar struggle in regard to Christ's *superhuman dignity*. The moment Nathaniel recognized in Jesus of Nazareth the expected Redeemer, he cried out, "Rabbi, thou art the Son of God"; and, long before the close of the public ministry, Peter, in the name of all the rest, made the articulate profession of faith, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." They believed Him to be the Son of God, in a sense in which it would have been blasphemy to affirm the same of any mere man. Instead, therefore, of deeming it a thing incredible, or highly improbable, that intimations of Christ's superhuman dignity should be found in the psalms, we think it in every way likely that they will be discoverable in a diligent search. In truth they are neither few nor recondite. Take these three verses:

"Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever:  
 A scepter of equity is the scepter of Thy kingdom" (xlv. 6).  
 Jehovah hath said unto me, Thou art my Son;  
 This day have I begotten Thee" (ii. 7).  
 "Thus saith Jehovah to my Lord,  
 Sit Thou at my right hand,  
 Until I lay Thy foes as a footstool at Thy feet" (cx. 1).

I do not forget the attempts that have been made to put a lower sense on each of these passages. I do not think they are successful. But suppose it were admitted to be just possible to put on each of them separately, a meaning that should come short of the ascription of superhuman dignity to the Son of David, we should still be entitled to deduce an argument in favor of our interpretation from the fact that in so many separate places, He is spoken of in terms which most naturally suggest the thought of a superhuman person. From the exclamation of Nathaniel

it is evident that the thought did suggest itself to the Jews, before the veil of unbelief settled down upon their hearts in the reading of the Old Testament. The truth is that, if a man reject the eternal Godhead of Christ, he must either lay the Psalms aside or sing them with bated breath. The Messiah whom they celebrate is fairer than the sons of men, one whom the peoples will praise for ever and ever (Ps. xlv. 2, 17). The ancient Jews understood the particular psalm now quoted to refer to the Messiah; and no one who heartily believes in the inspiration of the Psalter will be at a loss to discern in it more testimony to the proper Divinity of the Hope of Israel than could well have been discovered before His incarnation and death lighted up so many dark places of the ancient Scriptures. It will be sufficient for our purpose to indicate a single example. The coming of Jehovah to establish a reign of righteousness in all the earth is exultingly announced in several lofty psalms. It may be doubted, indeed, whether the ancient Jews were able to link these to the person of the Messiah; but we are enabled to do it, and have good ground to know that it was of Him that the Spirit spoke in them from the first. The announcement is thus made in the Ninety-sixth Psalm:

11. "Let the heavens rejoice and let the earth be glad;  
    Let the sea roar, and the fulness thereof;
12. Let the field be joyful, and all that is therein:  
    Then shall all the trees of the wood shout for joy
13. Before Jehovah: for He cometh, for He cometh to judge  
    the earth:  
    He shall judge the world with righteousness,  
    And the peoples with His faithfulness."

We know whose advent this is. No Christian can doubt that the proper response to the announcement is that furnished by the Book of Revelation, "Amen. Even so, come Lord Jesus."

The circumstance which lends peculiar instructiveness to this statement is that, although conceived in a popular vein, and addressed rather to instruct the popular mind than to meet the difficulties raised by sceptical criticism; although written with absolutely no fear of sceptical criticism before the eye,—witness the unhesitating employment of John's Gospel as testimony to historical fact—and of course without knowledge of the phases of criticism which belong particularly to the twentieth century: it yet in all its main assertions fits so nicely into the present state of critical

opinion that it might well have been written yesterday instead of fifty years ago. For example, it was rather bold fifty years ago to declare that it was the cross purely and simply, and not the assertion of a superhuman dignity for Christ, which was an offence to our Lord's Jewish contemporaries. Such a declaration is a commonplace today. There are few things which are more vigorously asserted by the latest phase of sceptical criticism than that the doctrine of a superhuman Messiah was native to pre-Christian Judaism. "The house was already prepared", declares W. Bousset;<sup>9</sup> "the faith in Jesus only needed to enter it." The whole secret of the Christology of the New Testament, explains Hermann Gunkel,<sup>10</sup> lies in the fact that it was the Christology of pre-Christian Judaism before it was the Christology of Christianity. It came from afar—this picture of the heavenly King, he intimates; but it had taken such hold of men that they could not free themselves from it.

Nothing could lie further from the purpose of writers of this tendency, of course, than to justify faith in the superhuman nature of Jesus. Of nothing are they more firmly convinced than that Jesus was merely a man. The whole object of their particular reading of the history of the Jewish Messianic ideal is, indeed, to smooth the way for a credible account of the immediate acceptance of Jesus by His followers as a superhuman being, although He was really only human. The pre-Christian conception of the Messiah, they say, involved the ascription to Him of a superhuman nature, and the acceptance of Jesus as Messiah, therefore, necessarily carried with it the ascription to Him of a superhuman nature.<sup>11</sup> But one of the results of this point of view is, naturally, that the mind is released from the prepossessions which formerly hindered recognition of

<sup>9</sup> *Die jüdische Apokalyptik*, p. 59.

<sup>10</sup> *Zur religionsgeschichtlichen Verständnis des Neuen Testaments*, 1903, p. 93.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. W. Wrede, *Paul*, E. T. 1907. pp. 151 ff.; H. Weinel, *Saint Paul*, E. T. 1906, p. 313.

traces of belief in a superhuman Messiah in the earlier Jewish literature. Hermann Gunkel, for example, having concluded that the conception of the heavenly Christ must have arisen somewhere before the New Testament, and having found traces of it in the Jewish Apocalypses, is able to see something like it also, centuries earlier, in the prophets.<sup>12</sup> Traits of a mythical God-King shine through the picture which the Prophets draw of the Messiah. "He receives already in Isaiah names which belong literally to no man—God-Hero, Father of Eternity (*Is.* ix. 5); He is the King of the Golden Age, in which sheep and wolf lie down together (*Is.* xi.); especially striking is it that His birth is celebrated with various mysterious statements (*Is.* ix. 5, *Mic.* v. 2)—for a just-born human child cannot aid His people, though perhaps a Divine child can. It is observable that other prophets and many Psalmists speak of a God, who is to be King of the whole world; that is, Jahveh, whose coronation and ascension (*Is.* lxvii. 6, 9; *lvii.* 22) in the End-time are sung especially by many Psalmists." And so, he adds, we can feel no sort of wonder "when we meet in the later Apocalypses with a heavenly figure who is sometime to descend from heaven and establish a blessed kingdom on earth. This figure of the divine king is no new creation of Apocalyptic Judaism. It is the same figure which already lies at the basis of the prophetic hope."<sup>13</sup> The appeal to such passages as *Ps.* xlv. 6; ii. 7; cx. 1; xcvi. 11-13, as indications that the Messiah was thought of by the Psalmists as a superhuman being may now, then, hope for a more sympathetic hearing, in critical circles, than could be expected for it fifty years ago.

It undoubtedly does not make for edification to observe the expedients which have been resorted to by expositors to escape recognizing that these Psalms do ascribe a superhuman nature and superhuman powers to the Messiah. What they have done with *Ps.* xlv. 6—to take it as an ex-

<sup>12</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 93.

<sup>13</sup> *Op. cit.* pp. 24, 25.

ample<sup>14</sup>—"in order to avoid the addressing of the king with the word *Elohim*", as Franz Delitzsch puts it,<sup>15</sup> may be conveniently glanced at in the summary statement given by J. A. Selbie.<sup>16</sup> Rather than take it as it stands, they would prefer, it seems, to translate vilely, "Thy throne is God", "Thy throne of God", "Thy throne is of God", or to rewrite the text and make it say something else,—"Thy throne [its foundation is firmly fixed], God [has established it]", or "Thy throne [shall be] for ever".<sup>17</sup> Even Franz Delitzsch who turns away from such violent avoidances,<sup>18</sup> can permit the Psalmist his own word, only if he may be allowed an equally violent reduction of its meaning. Because, immediately after addressing the King by the great name of "God",—a name which in this class of Psalms confessedly means just God and nothing else<sup>19</sup>—the Psalmist refers the King to "God, thy God", Delitzsch supposes that the Psalmist must use "God" when applied to the King in some lowered sense. "Since elsewhere earthly authorities", he reasons,

<sup>14</sup> The helplessness with which they face the passage is illustrated by the note of G. S. Goodspeed, *Israel's Messianic Hope*, 1900, p. 69.

<sup>15</sup> *Psalms*, E. T. II, p. 82. The spirit in which expositors approach the matter is illustrated by the remark of J. H. Kurtz, *Zur Theologie der Psalmen*, 1865, pp. 52 f.: if "God" can be taken in a lower sense here, it must. Kurtz wishes to translate, "Thy throne of God".

<sup>16</sup> Hastings' *B. D.* IV, pp. 756-7.

<sup>17</sup> T. K. Cheyne, *The Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter*, 1891, pp. 181-2, while adopting the penultimate of these expedients, makes himself somewhat merry over the rest. In his *The Book of Psalms*, 1904, I, p. 198, he has eliminated the verse and no longer considers the (mutilated) Psalm to be addressed to an earthly king. "It has now," he says, "become superfluous to look for a contemporary king as the hero of the poem. . . ." It is "really a Messianic poem; the King, as the Targum says, is 'King Messiah'." It is a "description of the ideal King".

<sup>18</sup> That is to say in his *Commentary on the Psalms*. In his later *Messianic Prophecy*, 1890, E. T. p. 115, he appears to accept the rendering, "Thy throne of God" as probable.

<sup>19</sup> Delitzsch himself says: "It is certainly true that the custom of the Elohim Psalms of using *Elohim* as of equal dignity with *Jahve* is not favorable to this supposition."

are also called *Elohim* (Ex. xxi. 6; xxii. 7 ff.; Ps. lxxxii, *cf.* cxxxviii, 1) because they are God's representatives and the bearers of His image upon earth, so the king who is celebrated in this Psalm may be all the more readily styled *Elohim*, when in his heavenly beauty, his irresistible doxa or glory, and his divine holiness, he seems to the Psalmist to be the perfected realization of the close relationship in which God has set David and his seed to Himself. He calls Him *Elohim* just as Isaiah called the exalted royal child, whom he exultingly salutes in Ch. ix. 1-6, '*El Gibbor*. He gives Him this name, because in the transparent exterior of His fair humanity, he sees the glory and holiness of God as having attained a salutary or merciful conspicuousness among men. At the same time, however, he guards this calling of the king by the name of *Elohim* against being misapprehended, by immediately distinguishing the God, who stands above him, from the divine king, by the words "*Elohim*, Thy God," which in the Korahitic Psalms, and in the Elohistic Psalms in general, is equivalent to "*Jahve*, thy God" (xlivi. 4; xvlii. 15; 1. 7), and the two words are accordingly united by *Munach*.

Delitzsch does not believe, indeed, that when this is said, all has been said. According to his view, this was all that the writer of the Psalm meant; he was as far as possible from assigning Deity in any sense to the King he was addressing; he applies the term "God" to Him only in a lower sense of the word. But "the Church," in adopting this Psalm into its sacred use, attached another meaning to it, referring a song "which took its origin from some passing occasion, as a song for all ages, to the great King of the future, the goal of its hope". Its prophetically Messianic sense was "therefore not the original sense of the Psalm", though it was very ancient,<sup>20</sup> and was, indeed, conferred upon it by its admission into the Psalter.<sup>21</sup>

It is a refreshing return to common sense when the new critical school renounces these artificialities of interpretation, and begins by recognizing that the Psalmist in calling the King "God", means precisely what he says, namely to

<sup>20</sup> How ancient we may learn from the remark: "Just as Ezek. xxi. 32 refers back to **נִלְשׁוֹר**, Gen xlvi. 10, '*El Gibbor*, among the names of the Messiah in Is. ix. 6 (*cf.* Zech. xii. 18) refers back in a similar manner to Ps. xlv. 5."

<sup>21</sup> *Psalms*, E. T. II, pp. 73-74; *cf.* I. p. 67 and especially p. 70; also *Hebrews*, E. T. I, p. 77, *Messianic Prophecy*, E. T. p. 114.

ascribe the Divine name to the King he is addressing. The sense is quite clear, says Hermann Gunkel,<sup>22</sup> and we must not follow the multitude in explaining it away, and much less in altering the text. But, having recognized so much, Gunkel stops right there. The Messianic understanding of the Psalm (although that not only of the New Testament but of Judaism as well, from at least the time of the LXX), cannot come into consideration "for our scientific interpretation." Just an Israelitish king is meant, very likely Jero-boam II. That he is called "God" by the Psalmist is merely a solitary survival of a habit of speech common in the nations surrounding Israel, and, as we see here, not without its examples in Israel. "Veneration of kings as Gods was not rare in the ancient East; we are not surprised, therefore, that such a declaration meets us just once on the lips of an Israelitish singer. There was, no doubt, in ancient Israel a strong opposing current against such deification of the ruler; the genuine Jahve-religion, as it was advocated by the prophets, wishes that Jahve alone shall be God, and speaks with horror of everything human that would place itself by His side." We may learn from a passage like this, however,

that the distinction between the Divine and the human was not always and everywhere in Israel perfectly strictly conceived. There are many other passages also in which God and king are spoken of in the same breath; in which the king is compared with God or His angel; or in which he is called God's Son; and when Solomon built himself a throne, which stood on six steps flanked by lions, he imitated in it the throne of the highest God of heaven who sits high aloft above the seven heavenly stages, guarded by demons. Such a declaration as the singer's shows us, then, that there were tendencies approaching heathenism in ancient Israel, especially in the palace. In Israel, as elsewhere, it belonged to the court-style to promise an eternal dominion to the king, or eternal life to his house.

Hugo Gressmann<sup>23</sup> so far agrees with this, that he supposes that, in Ps. xlv. 6, we have a solitary "survival from

<sup>22</sup> *Ansgewählte Psalmen*, 1911, pp. 106 f. Similarly H. Gressmann, *Der Ursprung der israelitisch-jüdische Eschatologie*, 1905, pp. 255-256.

<sup>23</sup> *Op. cit.* pp. ff.

a period when it was more customary in Israel to call the king God"; "although", he adds, "the usage had perhaps never been very common". But he improves upon it by thinking of this custom as really little more than an instance of an inflated court-style, which had become acclimated in Israel, too, on the basis of general oriental models. The language which is employed of the king in such Psalms as the Second, Forty-fifth, Seventy-second and Hundred-and-tenth, cannot be taken literally, of course, of any earthly monarch. But, says Gressmann, it was never intended to be taken literally. It is merely the language of court-flattery and was fully understood to mean nothing. This was the language in which kings had been spoken of and to, say in Babylon, from of old. It had found its way, no doubt indirectly, possibly through Phoenicia, into Israel; and had been popularized there merely as a matter of court-form. Of course, it was gradually modified, in its Israelitish use, in the direction of an ever closer assimilation of it to the Israelitish point of view. The deification of the king, for example, regular in the case of the Babylonian-Assyrian kings and a dogma in Egypt, was more and more eliminated from the court-style as it was employed in Israel. "In the whole Old Testament, the (reigning) King is addressed only a single time by the title of God: 'Thy throne, O God, stands for ever and ever'" (Ps. xlv. 6). Other remnants of similarly inflated flattery have, however, better maintained their place. World-wide dominion is promised to the king; eternal life and power are ascribed to him; he is presented as the (adopted) Son of God. All such modes of speech are merely relics of a court-style which originated elsewhere, and which, as used in Israel, was without meaning. "From the technical designation of the king as Son of God (2 Sam. vii. 14, Psl. ii. 7) no inferences can be drawn as to the deification of the king. For it was merely the style to speak thus of the king, and, when it is the style to speak thus, nobody asks whether it has any meaning or not."<sup>24</sup> "The style permits the court-poet to

<sup>24</sup> P. 256.

praise any and every king as a world-ruler, even though the world which he really rules be no bigger than Israel.”<sup>25</sup> What we learn from such language is not how Israel thought of its king, and much less how Israel thought of its Messiah. There is no reference to the Messiah in this language; and Israel did not think thus of its king. What we learn is only where Israel got its court-style, and how that court-style was slowly modified in its use in Israel, to suit Israelitish modes of conception, until it was at last almost cleansed of its assimilation of the monarch to God.

The parallel between Delitzsch’s and Gressmann’s treatments of Ps. xlv. 6 should not be missed. Both start with the recognition that the Psalmist addresses the king as “God”. Both set themselves at once to empty that fact of its significance. Delitzsch pursues a philological method, and concludes that, in such a connection, “God” does not mean God, but rather something which is not God. Gressmann follows the religio-historical method, and concludes that, in such instances, “God” means just nothing at all; it is mere bombast. That the view taken of the Psalm by either was not the view taken of it by those who gave it a place in the Psalter, at least, each is compelled to allow. It owes its place in the Psalter in fact, as neither would deny, precisely to its not having been understood to speak meaninglessly, or even moderately, of any earthly king, but, in the loftiest of ascriptions, of King Messiah. The question which presses for answer is whether it is possible thus to evacuate the language of the Psalm of its meaning. That Gressmann’s method of evacuating it has some tactical advantage over that of the “psychological school” may be admitted. He is at least relieved from the necessity of accounting for the language employed from the Psalmist’s own experience. He avoids so far, therefore, the impact of the pointed questions of Ernst Sellin:<sup>26</sup> “When did an Anointed of Juda ever have dominion over the peoples of

<sup>25</sup> P. 262.

<sup>26</sup> *Der alttestamentliche Prophetismus*, 1912, p. 169.

the earth, against which they could rebel? When were the ends of the earth really promised by God to such an one, for his possession (Ps. ii.)? When and how could a king of Israel be called 'God', and his sons be constituted princes over the whole world, as is done in Ps. xlv. 7, 17; when did such an one rule from the Euphrates to the end of the earth, like the king of Ixxxviii. 8; and finally when did such an one lead a host out of the dew of the morning and hold judgment among the peoples like him of cx. 6?" But what advantage is it to escape these questions, only to fall into the way of the still more pointed one, When was it possible in Israel to ascribe to its kings *simpliciter* such Divine qualities and functions? Or, as Sellin sharply puts it, How could a king in Israel be directly addressed as God, as in Ps. xlv. 6?<sup>27</sup>

Is it adequate to say that it was natural for Israel to imitate the court-style of its neighbors, and that this court-style in its Israelitish employment had worn itself down, through long years of use, into a mere set of meaningless words? Kings had not existed in Israel for ever and ever; and Israel differed from the surrounding nations precisely in this—that there was but one God in Israel, and the king was not this God. "The deification of princes is everywhere else directly perhorrescent in Israel", remarks Sellin, and declares that there is but one solution possible: "a hymn which celebrated the Divine World-Savior is taken as

---

<sup>27</sup> Cf. T. K. Cheyne, *The Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter*, 1891, p. 181: "But from the severely monotheistic Jewish point of view, to represent this king as God, was impossible (Zech. xii. 8 is no proof to the contrary)." Also Gunkel, when speaking of Ps. xx, writes (*Ausgewählte Psalmen*<sup>3</sup>, p. 40 f.): "The piety is accordingly clear, which guards the singer from glorifying the king too much. This tone dominates also the other Royal Songs (xx, xxii, cx, ii) contained in the Psalter; they do not, or at least not in the first rank, glorify the king, but the God who protects and blesses him; a somewhat different 'more heathenish' note sounds, on the other hand, in the very ancient song, Ps. xlv. The deification of the King which was at home in the ancient orient from primitive times, was certainly an abomination to these pious people."

the basis of a wedding-song addressed to an earthly king, and he is lauded as the introducer of the new age, which this world-savior is expected sometime to introduce.”<sup>28</sup> That is to say, on the foundation of the new religio-historical point of view, Sellin returns in effect (although not altogether without defect, it must be allowed) to the old typical-messianic method of interpreting these Psalms.<sup>29</sup> They speak of the contemporary kings, but through them they speak of the Great King yet to come. And their language can receive its full meaning only when it is read with reference to Him.

In order that we may apprehend Sellin’s point of view, we shall need to have it before us in a somewhat broadened statement.<sup>30</sup> What we are particularly indebted to him for is the clearness with which he throws up to observation the main fact, that the center of Israel’s eschatology lay in the settled expectation of the universal establishment of the reign of Jehovah. The way he puts it is, “Jahve is to come and simply be manifested as Lord—that is the kernel of the whole eschatology.”<sup>31</sup> But alongside of this expecta-

<sup>28</sup> *Die israelitisch-jüdische Heilandserwartung*, 1909, p. 16 (the second and third parts of the fifth volume of the *Biblische Zeit- und Streitfragen*).

<sup>29</sup> *Prophetismus*, p. 129: “The right way to solve the riddle has been pointed out by Gunkel, though only by a modernization of what used to be contended for by Franz Delitzsch and others, when they said that David was here always the type of the Messiah. Hymns were written by court-poets to actual Israelitish or Jewish kings, on the occasion of their coronation or marriage, which transferred to them the long existent hope of the divine world-savior, and these songs became also prophecies.”

<sup>30</sup> An admirable account of Sellin’s views in their historical setting has been given to the readers of this REVIEW (October, 1913, vol. xi, pp. 630-649) by J. Oscar Boyd under the title of “The Source of Israel’s Eschatology”. W. Nowack’s criticisms of the *Heilandserwartung* in the *Theologische Rundschau* for 1912, vol. xv. pp. 91-96, and of the *Prophetismus* in the same Journal for 1914, vol. xvii, pp. 65-68, are also worth consulting.

<sup>31</sup> *Prophetismus*, p. 174. Cf. p. 172: “The coming of God as Lord and King, we have already presented as the kernel of the Old-Israelitish Eschatology of woe and weal.”

tion there runs, he tells us, throughout the literature, the hope of the coming of a world-savior, the coming of whom is described in much the same language as the coming of Jehovah Himself. We may be tempted to identify the two after a fashion which will eliminate Jehovah's coming in favor of that of this savior: Jehovah comes only in His representative. The difficulty is that, in the documents, the identification goes beyond the coming to the figures themselves. Nor will it quite meet the case to say that Jehovah's representative is clothed with the attributes of Jehovah. The epithets given to Him pass beyond official identification and imply personal identity. And yet not such personal identity as excludes all distinction, or even all subordination. We are confronted in this figure with a problem very similar to that which meets us in the mysterious figure of the Angel of Jehovah and similar methods of solving it will naturally occur to us. Now, as Sellin makes clear, this figure of a world-savior is both original and aboriginal in Israel. It was not, as Gunkel and Gressmann imagine, derived at a comparatively late date from the myths of Israel's oriental neighbors. The myths of Israel's oriental neighbors, in point of fact, knew nothing of such a figure. "The old-oriental literature," writes Sellin,<sup>32</sup> "has been searched with the greatest zeal, especially during the last decade for traces of a hope of a Divine Savior, of a new era of salvation to be brought in by him, and a return of Paradise. . . . But I hold it to be my duty to say at once without reserve, that not the slightest trace of proof has been adduced, that this era is to be introduced by a great and miraculous Divine-human ruler of the End-time. Absolutely all that has been said, up to today, of an old-oriental 'expectation of a redeemer-king' is merely construction,—or, where is there a Babylonian or Egyptian text which speaks of such a future redeemer as Jacob's blessing speaks of Shiloh,—and the like? . . . *The eschatological king is*

---

<sup>32</sup> P. 175.

*not known by the ancient orient.*”<sup>33</sup> It is quite possible that in expounding and adorning its expectation, Israel may have employed figures and conceptions derived from without. But the expectation itself is certainly its own. “The specifically Israelitish character and the original parentage of its kernel are firmly established; and its roots are not set in mythology but in the religion of Israel, in Israel’s belief in the God of Sinai, to whom in the end the world must belong.”<sup>34</sup>

Throughout the whole course of the history of Israel, we may trace this expectation of a Savior running parallel with the fundamental expectation of the coming of God as Ruler and King. The parallel is very complete.

“He too is the ruler over the peoples (Gen. xl ix. 10; Ps. lxxii. 11), to the ends of the earth (Deut. xxxiii. 27; Mic. v. 3; Zech. ix. 10 f.), the scepter-bearer over the nations (Numb. xxiv. 17-19; Ps. xlvi. 17) to whose dominion there are no limits (Is. ix. 6), etc.; he too bears sometimes but not often the title of “King” (Ps. xlvi. 2; lxxii. 1; Zech. ix. 9; Jer. xviii. 5), elsewhere those of “Judge” (Mic. v. 1), “Father” (ix. 5), “Anointed” or “Son of Jehovah” (Ps. ii. 2, 7). Precisely as the activity of the one, so that of the other is three-fold: it is his to destroy the enemies (Numb. xxiv. 17 b; Deut. xxxiii. 17; Ps. ii. 9; xlvi. 6; cx. 1, 2, 5); he has to judge (Is. ix. 6 b; xi. 3; Jer. xxiii. 56; Ps. lxxii. 6); and finally he has to “save” (Zech. ix. 9; Jer. xxiii. 6; Ps. lxxii. 4, 12), above all by bringing social betterment, Paradise, and universal peace (Gen. xlvi. 11, 12; Is. vii. 15, xi. 4, 6-9; Mic. iv. a, 5; Zech. iii. 9 b, 10; ix. 10 Ps. lxxii. 12, 16)<sup>35</sup>. . . . Moreover he is given a name, “Immanuel”, by which his appearance is notified as the fulfilment of Balaam’s prophecy of the end of the days, “Jahve, his God, is with him”; and he is further designated as “Star” (Numb. xxiv. 1), as “God-Hero” (Is. ix. 6), as “God’s Son” (Ps. ii. 7); . . . [and] exegesis is continually bringing us back to the idea that Is. vii. 14, Mic. viii. 2 assume thoroughly a miraculous birth for him without the aid of a man; . . . [and] there is promised to him when scarcely born, the dominion of the world (Gen. xl ix. 10; Is. ix. 5, Mic. v. 3).<sup>36</sup>

512

<sup>33</sup> We observe that even Meinhold thanks Sellin for saying this: “I am glad that Sellin declares strongly and clearly that ‘the eschatological king is not known to the ancient orient—naturally Israel excepted’ (*Theolog. Literaturzeitung*, 1913, 19, 580).

<sup>34</sup> P. 183.

<sup>35</sup> Pp. 172-3.

<sup>36</sup> P. 173.

The kernel of the whole matter is this:<sup>37</sup> "Israel's savior is, throughout the whole course of the Old Testament history the counterpart of the World-God who is sometime to bring woe and weal; precisely as of the one, so of the other there sounds out—from the oldest to the latest sources—although, no doubt with external differences, the mighty 'He comes' (*cf.* Gen. xlix. 10), 'He appears' (Mat. xxiv. 17), 'He cometh' (Zech. ix. 9), 'He is born' (Is. vii. 14, ix. 4), 'He comes forth' (xi. 1), 'He comes forth' (Mc. v. 1), 'He is raised up' (Jer. xxiii. 5), 'until He comes' (Eg. ii. 32), 'I will raise up' (xxxiv. 23), 'I bring' (Zech. iv. 8), 'I saw, there come' (Dan. vii. 13)." This continually recurring assurance that the Paradise-prince will come to destroy all enemies and judge even to the ends of the earth, forms the deepest core of the mystery—it is expressed by a single word in Hebrew, שׁׁמְךָ, in English, "He comes."<sup>38</sup> It stamps the religion of the Old Testament as specifically a religion of hope. "Yes, for us the Old Testament religion, from the very beginning is a religion of hope, prepared from the very beginning sometime to become the world-religion; the Old Testament God from the beginning the God of heaven and earth; who, it is true, first of all chose only that one people, but looked forward to the day when He should destroy all other Gods and bring all other peoples to His feet."<sup>39</sup> It is from Sinai, and from the revelation-act at Sinai alone that this religion of hope can have derived. "Here, and only here, can a foundation be laid for viewing the whole history from the point of sight of waiting for the appearance of the world-God, who is to fill the universe with His glory."<sup>40</sup> But as no man could look upon this His glory and live, an organ for its manifestation was necessary, and a type of this organ was given in the Paradisiacal man, who, though a creature of God, was made in the image of the Divine glory

<sup>37</sup> P. 181.

<sup>38</sup> P. 193.

<sup>39</sup> P. 192.

<sup>40</sup> P. 182.

and destined for communion with Him and the enjoyment of dominion over the world. Back to this figure, the old-oriental directed his eyes. "But in the old-Israelitish eschatology, this backwards directed longing became suddenly something wholly different—a clear, distinct, religiously oriented, historical expectation directed to the future: Jahve, the God of Sinai, will Himself, in this man, who, no doubt, is a creature, but who was with Him before the mountains were,—in this, His Chosen-One, His Servant, His Son—Himself come to establish the world-dominion, to judge Israel, and the peoples, to bring Paradise and the world-peace. There is no parallel to this assured confidence in the ancient orient."<sup>41</sup>

There are elements in this brilliant piece of constructive work which will require correction. The use made of the Paradisiacal man in the account given of the origin of Israel's expectation of a Savior, and the apparently defective Christology in part founded upon this, attract dissenting attention. But this ought not to blind us to the value of the broad presentation given us here of the eschatological hope of Israel, including, as it does, the correlation of the hope of the coming Savior with the hope of what we have been accustomed to speak of as "the advent of Jehovah." It has been usual to separate these two things mechanically and to set them over against one another as quite independent, and indeed never even osculating, items of Israel's belief.<sup>42</sup> Gunkel even represents them as mutually exclusive. "In the whole eschatology," he says,<sup>43</sup> "we can distinguish two tendencies, both of which speak of a coming King; whereas the one calls the king David or David's Son, in the other Jahve Himself in the Ruler of the future; everywhere where God's kingdom is spoken of, the human

<sup>41</sup> P. 182.

<sup>42</sup> E.g. E. Riehm, *Messianic Prophecy*, E. T. ed. 2, 1896, p. 281, supporting himself on Oehler, *Prolegomena zur Theologie des A.T.*, pp. 67 f. and art. "Messias," in Herzog's *Realencyclopaedia*, p. 408 f. So also Ottley, Hastings' *B.D.* 8, p. 45a, repeating Riehm.

<sup>43</sup> *Ausgewählte-Psalmen*<sup>3</sup>, pp. 191 f.

king is lacking, for a ‘Messiah’ has no place in ‘God’s kingdom.’” Charles A. Briggs, while he does not go so far as to represent these two elements of Old Testament eschatology as mutually contradictory, yet thinks, equally extremely, of the whole body of Old Testament Messianic hopes as a congeries of unharmonized items standing off in isolation from one another. “There are in the Old Testament,” he says,<sup>44</sup> “two distinct lines of Messianic idea—the one predicting the advent of God for redemption and judgment, the other predicting the advent of a redemptive man. The redemptive man is conceived sometimes as the Seed of the Woman or Seed of Abraham, as the Lion of Judah, as the Second Moses, as the Son of David, the Son of God, the Messiah, as the Martyr Servant, as the Priest King, as the Master Shepherd, as the Son of Man. It is impossible to combine these in any unity, so far as the Old Testament is concerned. And there is not the slightest indication that there is any coincidence of the line of the divine advent with the line of the advent of any of these human Messiahs.” The effect of a comprehensive presentation of the material like Sellin’s is thoroughly to do away with such impressions. The complete synthesis of the various representations waits, of course, for the fulfilment of them all in one Person. But it becomes clear at least that the hope of the coming of the world-savior, which includes in it the more specifically defined “Messianic” hope, is but another aspect of the hope of the coming of Jehovah to judge the world and to introduce the eternal kingdom of peace. One of the results of this is that the testimony of the Old Testament to “the transcendent Messiah” becomes pervasive. We no longer look for it in a text here and there which we are tempted to explain away as unexpected, perhaps intolerable, exaggerations, but rather see it involved in the entire drift of the eschatological expectations of the Old Testament, and view the special texts in which it finds par-

---

<sup>44</sup> *The Incarnation of the Word*, 1902, p. 173 f.

ticularly poignant expression as only the natural high lights thrown up upon the surface of the general picture.

This underlying coalescence of the advent of Messiah and the advent of Jehovah is perhaps more commonly vaguely felt than is generally recognized. It seems to be thus felt—in his own way and from his own point of view, of course,—by Gressmann.<sup>45</sup>

In the Israelitish eschatology [he writes] the Messiah and Jahve alternate. That is already intelligible, because the Messiah is ultimately a Divine figure, a God-king, and is thus elevated into the sphere of Deity. It becomes more intelligible when we observe a second parallel fact. Almost everywhere where Jahve meets us in the eschatology of weal, He is presented in a quite distinctive way. We can refer the descriptions which are given of Him and the functions which are ascribed to Him to the conception of the eschatological king. With respect to the thing, not to the person, the Jahve here described and the Messiah were originally as it seems counterparts: the functions of the two are still almost identical. The Messiah is described more as a King exalted into God, Jahve more as God exalted into the King. It is no doubt possible that in the eschatology which influenced the Israelitish religion, a single figure which united in itself the traits of both, occupied a middle ground. In its passage to Israel this figure was divided, and the one, the more divine, side of its being was assigned to Jahve, the other, the more human side of its being to the Messiah. The eschatological hero, which originally bore rich mythical traits, that are still perceptible in the older prophecy, up to Isaiah and Micah, is in the course of time ever more degraded into an earthly king, and acquired a purely national character. Jahve, however, was inhibited from this development, since He could not lose the Divine type. Accordingly we may perhaps again ascribe to the *original* eschatological figure the things which in the *present* tradition are no longer said of the Messiah, but only now of Jahve.<sup>46</sup>

Such a speculation cannot commend itself to sober thought; but the fact that it suggests itself to Gressmann hints of what he finds in the Old Testament descriptions of the Messiah, and of the relation which the hope of His coming bore to the hope of the advent of Jehovah, and indeed which His person bore to the person of Jehovah. He who reads the Old Testament, however cursorily, will not

<sup>45</sup> *Der Ursprung*, etc., p. 294.

<sup>46</sup> P. 301.

escape a sense, however dim, that he is brought into contact in it with a Messiah who is more than human in the fundamental basis of His being, and in whose coming Jehovah visits His people in some more than representative sense.

It is naturally the customary representation of Franz Delitzsch that the two lines of prediction never meet in the pages of the Old Testament, but wait for their conjunction until He to whom they both point had come. Says he:<sup>47</sup>

For the announcement of salvation in the Old Testament runs on two parallel lines: the one has for its termination the Anointed of Jahve, who rules all nations out of Zion; the other the Lord Himself, sitting above the Cherubim, to whom all the earth does homage. These two lines do not meet in the Old Testament; it is only the fulfilment that makes it plain, that the advent of the Anointed One and the advent of Jahve are one and the same. . . . An allegory may serve to illustrate the way in which the Old Testament proclamation of salvation unfolds itself. The Old Testament in relation to the Day of the New Testament is Night. In this Night there rise in opposite directions, two stars of Promise. The one describes its path from above downwards; it is the promise of Jahve who is about to come. The other describes its path from below upwards: it is the hope which rests on the seed of David, the prophecy of the Son of David, which at the outset assumes a thoroughly human and merely earthly character. These two stars meet at last, they blend together into one star: the Night vanishes and it is Day. This one Star is Jesus Christ, Jahve and the Son of David in one person, the King of Israel and at the same time the Redeemer of the world—in a word, the God-man!<sup>48</sup>

Elsewhere however he speaks with a juster divination:<sup>49</sup>

We find indeed undeniable traces in the Old Testament of a prophetic *vr. sentiment* that the great Messias of the future, who was destined to accomplish what had been vainly looked for in David and Solomon, etc., should also present in His own person an

<sup>47</sup> *Psalms*, E. T. I, p. 67 f., cf. p. 70.

<sup>48</sup> *Psalms*, E.T. II, p. 300 (on Ps. lxxxii). Cf. the similar statement of W. T. Davidson, in Hastings' *B.D.* IV, p. 151. Delitzsch seems to imply that it is only to Jehovah and not to the Messiah that the function of Savior is ascribed (cf. G. Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, p. 295); this can be sustained only if we take the term "the Messiah" in too narrow a sense.

<sup>49</sup> *Hebrews*, E. T. I, p. 79.

unexampled union of human and divine. The mystery of the incarnation is still veiled through the Old Testament, and yet the two great lines of prophecy running through it—one leading on to a final manifestation of Jehovah, the other to the advent of a Son of David—do so meet and coalesce at certain points, as by the light thus generated, to burst through the veil. This is as clear as day in the one passage, where the Messias is plainly called אֵל נָבוּ (the Mighty God), an ancient traditional appellation for the Most High (Deut. x. 17; 22:17; cf. Jer. xxxii. 8; Neh. ix. 32; Ps. xxiv. 8). And so (Jer. xxiii. 6) He is entitled “Jehovah our righteousness”, following which, as Biesenthal has shown (p. 7), the ancient synagogue recognized Jehovah (יְהוָה) as one of the names of the Messiah.<sup>50</sup>

That the New Testament writers throughout proceed on the assumption that all those Old Testament passages in which the Advent of Jehovah is spoken of refer to the coming of the Messiah, Delitzsch himself is led to tell us when commenting on the catena of passages adduced in the first chapter of Hebrews in support of the Deity of Christ, among which are some of this kind.<sup>51</sup> Their consciousness of the identity of the two comings “finds an utterance”, as Delitzsch reminds us, “at the very threshold of the evangelical history.” (Lk. i. 17, 26) when Malachi’s prediction of the coming of Elijah “before the day of Jehovah” to prepare His way, is adduced as fulfilled in John the Baptist the forerunner of Jesus.<sup>52</sup> We shall at once recall also the similar appeal of all three of the Synoptic Gospels to Is. xliii. 3, as fulfilled in John the Baptist. In Jesus they saw all the lines of Messianic prediction converge; and they declare Him no less the Jehovah who was expected to come to save His people, than the Son of David or the Suffering Servant of God. “When St. Mark tells us”, remarks Charles A. Briggs justly, “that St. John the Baptist was the herald of the advent of Yahweh, at the beginning of the Gospel, what else can he mean than that Jesus Christ whose redemptive

<sup>50</sup> Cf. on this Messianic title, A. Edersheim, *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, 1883, I, p. 178, who gives the references.

<sup>51</sup> *Hebrews*, E. T. I, pp. 71-72.

<sup>52</sup> Cf. A. B. Davidson, *Old Testament Prophecy*, 1913, p. 412. Cf. also pp. 311, and 147.

life is the theme of his Gospel was the very Yahweh?" And, we add, what can he mean except that, in predicting this advent of Jehovah, Isaiah was proclaiming the Deity of the Messiah in whose coming it was to be fulfilled? The same is true also, of course, of Matthew and Luke in their parallel passages, so that Briggs is thoroughly justified<sup>53</sup> in summing up "with confidence" in the remark that "the three Synoptic Evangelists agree in thinking of Jesus Christ as the Yahweh of the Old Testament, and that His advent, as heralded by St. John the Baptist, was the Divine advent of the Second Isaiah, as well as the human advent of the Servant of Yahweh; in other words that they saw in Jesus Christ the Messiah of history, the coincidence of the line of the divine redeemer with the line of the human Messiah; that they saw all the Messianic ideals combine in Him." The only difference between John and the other Evangelists here is that the identification of the Baptist with the voice crying in the wilderness, "Prepare ye the way of Jehovah", which the others make on their own account, John quotes from the lips of the Baptist. Briggs thinks the identification can scarcely have been made by the Baptist.<sup>54</sup> Such a judgment is certainly rash in view of the exalted conception which the Baptist in any event expresses of Him whose mere forerunner he undoubtedly recognizes himself as being. His shoelatches he declares himself unworthy to unloose; he calls Him the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world; he even gives Him the great name of the Son of God—a name which in this context must surely bear its metaphysical sense (*cf.* verses 7 and 25). Beginning on this note, the New Testament proceeds throughout its whole extent on the unchanging supposition that in the coming of Jesus Christ there is fulfilled the repeated Old Testament promise, made in Psalm and Prophet alike, that God is to visit His people, in His own good time, to save them. It is therefore, indeed, so we are told, that He is

---

<sup>53</sup> P. 182.<sup>54</sup> P. 171.

called Jesus,—precisely because “it is He that shall save His people from their sins”—He, that is, Jesus, shall save His people, that is, Jesus’ people,—in fulfilment of the promise of the Saving Jehovah.

Among the high lights thrown up on the surface of the general picture of the Divine Messiah, as it lies on the pages of the Old Testament, such a passage as Is. ix. 6 challenges attention with the same consistency as Ps. xlv. 6, and has met with much the same treatment at the hands of the expositors. There have always been some, of course, who have not shrunk from reading the passage as it stands, and giving it its obvious meaning. Outstanding instances are supplied by E. W. Hengstenberg and J. A. Alexander. Alexander, speaking of the hypothesis that by the child mentioned by the prophet Hezekiah is meant—an hypothesis once much in vogue, but now out of date—and the unnatural explanations of particular terms which it compelled, writes:<sup>55</sup>

The necessity of such explanations is sufficient to condemn the exegetical hypothesis involving it, and shows that this hypothesis has only been adopted to avoid the natural and striking application of the words to Jesus Christ, as the promised *child*, emphatically *born for us* and *given to us*, as the *Son of God*, and the *Son of man*, as being *wonderful* in his person, works, and *sufferings*—a *counsellor*, prophet, and authoritative teacher of the truth, a wise administrator of the Church, and confidential adviser of the individual believer—a real man but yet the *mighty God*—eternal in his own existence, and the *giver of eternal life* to others—the great *peace-maker* between God and man, between Jew and Gentile, the umpire between nations, the abolisher of war, and the giver of internal peace to all who *being justified by faith have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ* (Rom. v. 1). The doctrine that this prophecy relates to the Messiah was not disputed even by the Jews, until the violence of the anti-Christian controversy drove them from the ground which their own progenitors had steadfastly maintained. In this departure from the truth they have been followed by some learned writers who are Christians only in the name, and to whom may be applied with little alteration, what one of them (Gesenius) has

---

<sup>55</sup> *Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah*, 1874, I, p. 204.

said with respect to the ancient versions of this very text, viz. that the general meaning put upon it may be viewed as the criterion of a Christian or an anti-Christian writer.

Hengstenberg's remarks we prefer to give through the medium of T. K. Cheyne, who, in one of the stages of his ever-shifting opinion, adopts the core of them as his own. In an essay on "The Christian Element in the Book of Isaiah", Cheyne remarks:<sup>56</sup>

Both parts of Isaiah give us to understand clearly (and not as a mere *ὑπένθυμα*) that the agent of Jehovah in the work of government and redemption is himself divine. Not indeed the much vexed passage in iv. 2, where, even if the date of this prophecy allowed us to suppose an allusion to the Messiah, "sprout of Jehovah" is much too vague a phrase to be a synonym of "God's Only-begotten Son". But the not less famous *'El Gibbōr* in ix. 6 may and must still be quoted. As Hengstenberg remarks it "can only signify God-Hero, a Hero who is infinitely exalted above all human heroes by the circumstance that he is *God*. To the attempts at weakening the import of the name, the passage x. 21, [where *'El Gibbōr* is used of Jehovah] opposes a very inconvenient obstacle."<sup>57</sup> And who can doubt that, granting the subject of chap. liii. to be an individual, he must be the incarnation of the Divine?

Cheyne's direct comment on the passage itself in this work needs to be read in the light of these remarks to preserve it from ambiguity; but he doubtless means it to be taken in much the same sense which he unambiguously expresses here. "The meaning of the phrase," he declares,<sup>58</sup> "is defined by x. 21, where it occurs again of Jehovah"; that is to say, the Messiah is declared to be God in the same sense in which Jehovah is God. When he proceeds to say, "It would be uncritical to infer that Isaiah held the metaphysical oneness of the Messiah with Jehovah," he does not require to mean more than that Isaiah is not to be inferred to have as yet clearly formulated in his mind the doctrine of the Trinity,—and need not be supposed to have adjusted in his thinking the Deity of the Messiah to the

<sup>56</sup> *The Prophecies of Isaiah*, 1884, II, p. 209.

<sup>57</sup> *Christology of the Old Testament*, Edinburgh ed., II, p. 88.

<sup>58</sup> *Op. cit.*, I, p. 61 f.

fundamental doctrine of the unity of the Godhead. But when he goes on to say, "But he evidently does conceive the Messiah, somewhat as the Egyptians, Assyrians and Babylonians regarded their kings, as an earthly representative of Divinity (see on xiv. 13-14)", the comparison, although probably inevitable, yet tends to lower the conception of '*El Gibbor*' beyond its power to stretch. Accordingly Cheyne continues: "No doubt the development of Messianic doctrine was accelerated by contact with foreign nations; still it is in harmony with fundamental Biblical ideas and expressions. This particular title of Messiah is, no doubt, unique. But if even a Davidic king may be described as 'sitting upon the throne of Jehovah' (1 Chr. xxix. 23), and the Davidic family be said, in a predictive passage it is true, to be 'as God (*ēlohim*), or the (or, an) angel of Jehovah' (Zech. xii. 8), much more may similar titles be applied to the Messiah. The last comparison would, indeed, be especially suitable to the Messiah, and it is a little strange that we do not find it." So far the tendency seems to be to lower the implication of the title,<sup>59</sup> but the lost ground is now recovered: "But we do find the Messiah, in a well-known Psalm, invited to sit at the right hand of Jehovah (Ps. cx. 1), and it is only a step further to give him the express title, 'God the Mighty One'. It is no doubt a very great title. The word selected for 'God' is not *ēlohim*, which is applied to the judicial authority (Ex. xxi. 6, xxii. 8), to Moses (Ex. vii. 1), and to the apparition of Samuel (1 Saml. xxviii. 13); but *el* which, whenever it denotes (as it generally does; and in Isaiah always) Divinity, does so in an absolute sense;—it is never used hyperbolically or metaphorically."<sup>60</sup>

<sup>59</sup> In his later work: *The Book of the Prophet Isaiah: A New English Translation*, 1898, p. 145, Cheyne actually lowers his view of the meaning of '*El Gibbōr*'.

<sup>60</sup> Cf. Hengstenberg, *Christology*, II, 85 on the meaning of '*El*' and the impossibility of rendering it (as Gesenius does) by "hero"; cf. also the citations given by J. D. Davis, in the *Princeton Biblical and Theological Studies*, 1912, p. 99.

The thing most insisted upon by Cheyne in these remarks is that *'El Gibbōr* can mean nothing but "Mighty God"; as Is. x. 21 shows. It illustrates the uncertainty of touch which characterizes the "Liberal" criticism of this type, that, in his later book on Isaiah, he simply deserts this ground and explains *'El Gibbōr* as describing the ideal king as induced from on high with might, and comments somewhat blindly: "x. 21, which shows that we are not to render *divine hero*; the king seems to Isaiah in his lofty enthusiasm, like one of those *angels* (as we moderns call them), who, in old time were said to mix with men, and even contend with them, and who, as superhuman beings, were called by the name of *'el* (Gen. xxxii. 2-32)." If Is. x. 21, where Cheyne himself renders *'El Gibbōr*, "the Mighty God" (p. 23), shows that this term cannot be rendered "divine hero," but at least, as he himself renders it, "Mighty Divinity"—which seems synonymous with "Mighty God"—it is difficult to see how Isaiah by its use designates the ideal king (not now the Messiah) an angel and not a God. By reducing the person spoken of from the Messiah to the king, and the dignity ascribed to him from the Divine to the angelic rank, Cheyne has, no doubt, effectually removed the passage from the category of Old Testament testimonies to the Deity of the Messiah. But he appears to have done so only at the cost not only of some violence, but also of some confusion.

It is to attain this end that the exegesis of the "Old Liberal school" is particularly directed, and that exegesis seems patient of nearly any conclusion which falls short of ascribing Deity to the Messiah.<sup>61</sup> E. Kautzsch can lay it down dogmatically as a principle of exegesis, which must govern the rendering of *'El Gibbōr*, that "an absolute prediction of Godhead, even in the case of the Messiah, would be inconceivable in the Old Testament".<sup>62</sup> He therefore denies that

<sup>61</sup> The various senses which have been put upon the words *'El Gibbōr* have been collected and discussed by J. D. Davis, as cited, pp. 93-105.

<sup>62</sup> Hastings' *B.D.*, extra volume, 1904, p. 895 b.

it is possible to take the term as "hero God", and insists on translating it "God of a hero", that is "Godlike hero". And George Adam Smith can actually permit himself to write such sentences as these:<sup>63</sup>

In any case the application of these prophecies to Jesus Christ must be made with discrimination. They have been too hastily used as predictions of the Godhead of the Messiah. But not even do the names in Chapter ix. 6 b imply Deity, while all the functions attributed to the promised King are human. Isaiah's Messiah is an earthly monarch of the stock of David, and with offices that are political, both military and judicial. He is not the mediator of spiritual gifts to his people, forgiveness, a new knowledge of God and the like. It is only in this, that he saves the people of God from destruction and reigns over them with justice in the fear of God, that he can be regarded as a type of Jesus Christ.

We have only to place by the side of this an equally brief statement emanating from a newer school, for its marvellousness to strike the eye. Martin Brückner writes:<sup>64</sup>

In any case "the old-prophetic Messiah-consciousness", for example, of Isaiah, would not be, on the assumption of the genuineness of his Christology, that of a "purely human King of David's line" but that of the Apocalyptic introducer of the blessed end-time. For a Messiah who reigns "without end" (ix. 6), who is called the God-Hero and the Eternal One, who is the personal concentration of the Spirit (xi. 2 ff.), and destroys the wicked with the breath of His mouth (xi. 4), is not "purely human" but superhuman, wholly apart from this—that the kingdom over which he reigns is the miraculous kingdom of peace and blessedness, the splendor of which is the light of the benighted peoples (ix. 1 ff.; xi. 7 ff.).

The several representatives of the "Old Liberal School" differ very much among themselves, of course, in details of interpretation. The thing which they are agreed upon is that the Messiah is called *'El Gibbōr*—whatever that may be made to mean—not because he is himself Divine, but because he is the representative of Jehovah on earth. It is allowed that the description given of him scales all the

<sup>63</sup> *Modern Criticism and the Teaching of the Old Testament*, 1901, p. 161; cf. Hastings' *B.D.*, II, 491.

<sup>64</sup> *Die Entstehung der paulinischen Christologie*, 1903, p. 97, note.

heights permissible to such a representative. "In the brilliant picture of chapter ix.", writes G. S. Goodspeed,<sup>65</sup> "the child who occupies the throne of David is to overthrow the enemy and to rule for ever and ever. The names which are given him describe a personage more glorious than any prophet has hitherto mentioned, except perhaps the writer of Psalm xlv." But, however glorious, they fall short of declaring him divine. "These divine titles", writes James Critchton,<sup>66</sup> "do not necessarily"—what is the function of this "necessarily" here?—"imply that in the mind of the prophet the Messianic king is God in the metaphysical sense—the essence of the divine nature is not a dogmatic conception in the Old Testament"—surely a blind remark!—"but only that Jehovah is present in Him in perfect wisdom and power, so that He exercises over His people for ever a fatherly and peaceful rule". Perhaps, however, Eduard Riehm may still stand as the typical representative of this system of interpretation. The Messiah, says he,<sup>67</sup> is represented in Old Testament prophecy

as a human king, an offspring of the stem of David, whose eminence is far above the position of all other men, and whose personality has about it something wonderful and mysterious. Although it is nowhere indicated that he is to enter the world in an extraordinary and wonderful manner,<sup>68</sup> he yet, as the earthly representative of the Divine King, and his instrument in establishing the kingdom, and exercising His government, stands in an absolutely unique and intimate relationship to God, Whose Spirit rests upon him as upon no other, and Whose almighty power, wisdom, righteousness and helpful grace work through him in such full measure that in and through his government God's great name, that is, His revealed glory is made known. In other words, God makes him the organ of His self-revelation, just as elsewhere He uses the "angel of Jehovah". Hence, even the divine designation *'El Gibbōr* (God-hero) is one of the names ascribed to him; and hence also, even in a more general announcement applied to the house of David, there occurs the expression:

<sup>65</sup> *Israel's Messianic Hope*, 1900, p. 120.

<sup>66</sup> Orr's, *International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia*, 1918, p. 2040.

<sup>67</sup> *Messianic Prophecy*, 1884, E. T., 1891, p. 280; cf. p. 182.

<sup>68</sup> This means, of course that Riehm does not regard Is. vii. 14, Mic. v. 1 as involving this for the Messiah.

"it shall be as God and the *angel of Jehovah* before" the inhabitants of Jerusalem. Both in the kingdom of God and in humanity, the Messiah assumes thus a central position, not only as their "head" but also as the mediating organ whence proceed the judicial and saving operations and the self-revelation of the Divine King.

It is no more than this that A. F. Kirkpatrick says when he expounds the Isaian declaration as follows:<sup>69</sup>

The fourfold name of this prince declares his marvellous nature and proclaims him to be, in an extraordinary way, the representative of Jehovah. The title, *Wonderful Counsellor* conveys the idea of his endowment with supernatural wisdom in that counsel which was peculiarly the function of a king. *Mighty God* expresses his divine greatness and power, as the unique representative of Jehovah, who is Himself the *Mighty God* (x. 21). *Eternal Father* describes his paternal fondness and unending care for his people. *Prince of Peace* denotes the character and end of his government. His advent is still future but it is assured. The zeal of Jehovah of hosts will perform this.

To the exposition of the term "the Mighty God" Kirkpatrick attaches a footnote, which without comment adduces the following words from C. Orelli: "In such passages the Old Testament revelation falls into a self-contradiction, from which only a miracle has been able to deliver us, the Incarnation of the Son of God." Thus, and thus only, does he intimate that he is aware that the treatment of the epithet "Mighty God" as a suitable one for a merely human representative of Jehovah, however unique, does violence to all linguistic propriety.

Orelli, from whom the quotation is taken, it is needless to say, did not write the words taken over from him on any such hypothesis. In his opinion the prophet has in view a truly superhuman figure and one gets the impression, as he reads Orelli's exposition of the passage, that, so far as he fails to give its full meaning, the failure is due to a defect in his Christological thought, rather than to unwillingness to take the prophet at the height of his meaning. He writes:<sup>70</sup>

<sup>69</sup> *The Doctrine of the Prophets*<sup>2</sup> 1897, p. 193.

<sup>70</sup> *Old Testament Prophecy*, E. T., p. 274 f.

When in the first name a miraculous, divine character is ascribed to the ruler in his capacity of counselor, planning for his people's good, this is saying more than that his wisdom exceeds that usual among rulers; it is affirmed that his wisdom is related to the human as divine. Just so, the second predicate attributes to him energy in action. He is called *strong God*, not merely a divine hero: *a God of a hero*, for בָּרוּךְ is an adjective, and the phrase cannot be understood differently than in x. 21, where it is used of the Lord Himself. In this second name, also, doubtless, a definite expression of his dignity, one side of his working, is taken into view, namely, his divine energy in action, as in the first the superhuman grandeur of his counsel; but his person itself is thereby raised to divine greatness. He is called *strong God* in a way which would be inapplicable to a man, unless the one God who rightly bears the name *strong God* were perfectly set forth in this His Anointed One. In such passages, the Old Testament revelation falls into a self-contradiction, from which only a miracle has been able to deliver us, the Incarnation of the Son of God. Elsewhere it draws the sharpest limit between the holy God and the sinful children of man, and its superiority to heathen religions depends in great part on this limit. Prophecy gradually lets this limit drop, in proof that the aim of God's action is to transcend it and to unite Himself most closely with humanity. In such oracles we Christians find no deification of the human such as is the order of the day on heathen soil. Otherwise prophecy would be a retrogression from the teaching of the law into heathenism and heathen idealism. But in such oracles we find a clear proof that even in the time of the old covenant the Spirit of God was consciously striving after the good that we see reached in the new.

"Divine wisdom", he continues after a page or two,<sup>71</sup> "divine strength, paternal love faithful as God's, divine righteousness and peace are ascribed to him, in such a way, indeed, that his person also appears divine: he perfectly exhibits God in the world; consequently his dominion is really God's dominion on earth. Every Judaising and rationalizing attempt to adapt the insignia conferred on the Messiah here to a man of our nature, degrades them, and with them the Spirit who forms them." After this there is nothing left to say except what V. H. Stanton says with the simplicity of truth:<sup>72</sup> "Language is used" in this passage "to

<sup>71</sup> P. 277.

<sup>72</sup> *Jewish and Christian Messiah*, p. 104.

which only the person of a truly Divine Messiah could adequately correspond." This appears to be recognized, after his own fashion, even by G. B. Gray, when he comments:<sup>73</sup>

Some of the names singly and even more in combination, are, as applied to men, unparalleled in the Old Testament, and on this account are regarded by Gressmann (p. 280 ff.) as mythological and traditional; cf. also Rosenmüller, *Scholia* . . . . The Child is to be more than mighty . . . more than a mighty man. . . more than a mighty king; he is to be a mighty **בָּנָה**, God. This attribution of divinity, implying that the Messiah is to be a kind of demi-God, is without clear analogy in the Old Testament, for Ps. xlv. 7 (6) is ambiguous.

The language in which this comment is couched, as well as the direct reference to him, recalls us to the effect on the interpretation of the passage of the new point of view introduced by Gressmann and his fellow-workers in the field of the history of religion.<sup>74</sup> The essence of this new point of view lies in the contention that the religious development and the religious language of Israel are to be explained after the analogy of the religious development and the religious language of the neighboring peoples; and on the assumption of a common body of old-oriental mythical ideas underlying them all alike. How this applies to the Messianic conceptions of Israel Gunkel briefly explains to us. He says:<sup>75</sup>

The figure of the Messiah, too, belongs to this originally mythological material. It is true that the new David or sprout of David whom the prophets expect, is only a man, though endowed with divine powers, and the hope that such a king should arise and bless Israel is primarily a purely natural one. But there are traits in this figure of a king, nevertheless, which intimate to us that this expected king was originally a God-king. Already in Isaiah he receives names which literally belong to no man: God-hero, Father of Eternity; he is the king of the Golden Age when sheep and wolf lie down together; particularly striking is it that his birth is celebrated repeatedly with mysterious statements, and

<sup>73</sup> *Isaiah* (International Critical Commentary), 1912, p. 123.

<sup>74</sup> Cf. for example Julius Boehmer, "Reichgottesspuren in de Völkerwelt" in Schlatter and Lütgert's *Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie*, 1906, x-i, p. 87.

<sup>75</sup> *Zum religionsgeschichtliche Verständnis*, p. 24 f.

that the salvation of Israel is hoped for from it: for a fresh-born human child cannot help his people, though no doubt a divine child could. We notice also that other prophets and many psalmists speak of a God who is to be King of the whole world; that is, Jahveh whose enthronement and ascension in the last times the Psalmists particularly sing. The whole material falls most beautifully into order if we assume that the Israelitish hope of a king was preceded by an alien mythical one, according to which a new God ascends as King the throne of the world. And it therefore does not surprise us when we meet in the later Apocalypses with a heavenly figure who is to come from heaven and establish a blessed kingdom on earth. This figure of a divine king is, therefore, no new creation of Apocalyptic Judaism: but it is the same figure which already lies at the foundation of the prophetic hopes."

This ingenious construction has been worked out into greater detail by Gressmann and set forth by him in perhaps as attractive a form as it is capable of receiving.<sup>76</sup> The difficulty with it is that it requires too many assumptions, and that these assumptions receive no support from the facts. As we have already seen, the ancient orient knows nothing of an eschatological king.<sup>77</sup> Israel knows as little of a deified King.<sup>78</sup> The whole mythological framework of the edifice thus breaks down. E. Sellin has solidly shown, moreover, that the entire development which it is here sought to explain on the basis of an alien mythology taken over by Israel from its neighbors, is purely native to Israel and has its roots set in the revelation-act at Sinai.<sup>79</sup>

The promulgation of this new view, however, has focussed attention on the prophetic language to which it seeks to assign a mythological significance,—with the effect of rendering the current attempts to explain that language away absurd. It has become quite clear in the course

<sup>76</sup> *Der Ursprung*, pp. 250-301. Arthur Drews, of course, makes the most of it, in his fashion: *Christusmythe*, pp. 8-9.

<sup>77</sup> See above, p. 386, 7.

<sup>78</sup> Gressmann writes, *op. cit.*, p. 285: "The general religious presupposition under which alone a figure like that of the God-King could be formed, is the king-deification, which, to be sure cannot be proved for Israel, but certainly may be for its neighboring nations."

<sup>79</sup> *Der alttestament. Prophetismus*, p. 183: "The specifically Israelitish

of the discussion that the prophets do attribute a divine nature and do ascribe divine functions to the Messiah. Indeed, the entire body of "results" of the "Old Liberal" criticism concerning the development of the Messianic hope—which it tended to relegate more and more completely to post-exilic times—has been hopelessly broken up.<sup>80</sup> It has again been made plain that the Messianic hope was aboriginal in Israel, and formed, indeed, in all ages the heart of Israelitish religion. In sequence to this, much of the disintegrating criticism of the documents which had been indulged in for the purpose of giving a semblance of versimilitude to the hypothesis of the late origin of the Messianic development, has become antiquated; the integrity and early date of sections and passages hitherto removed to a late period have been restored; and the unity of the Messianic hope in Israel, throughout all ages, has been vindicated,—so that, from the beginning down through the Apocalypses of the later Judaism and the songs of the earlier chapters of the Gospel of Luke, we see exhibited essentially a single unitary hope. In a passage written with great restraint, Herman Bavinck describes the effect produced by the introduction of the new view, thus.<sup>81</sup>

In place of the feverish efforts which were more and more ruling in the dominant school of literary criticism to remove all Messianic prediction to post-exilic times; it is now acknowledged that the preexilic prophets, not only themselves cherished such Messianic expectations, but also presuppose them among the people; nor have they themselves excogitated them and proclaimed them as novelties to the people; but they have received them from the past and are building on expectations which have

character and the original grounding of its kernel is certain. And its roots are set not in mythology but in the religion of Israel, in Israel's belief in the God of Sinai, to whom in the end the world must belong." So, p. 182: "The real root of the expectation of a Savior lies also here in the revelation act of Sinai. Here and here only could a foundation be laid for viewing the whole history under the point of sight of waiting for the appearance of the world-God, who is to fill the universe with His glory."

<sup>80</sup> Cf. what Sellin says, *Der alttestament. Prophetismus*, pp. 167-8.

<sup>81</sup> *Gereformeerde Dogmatiek*, 1910, p. 249.

existed from ancient times and have been current in Israel. Accordingly this new tendency among Old Testament scholars, as good as altogether discards the earlier interpolation hypothesis and recognizes a high antiquity for all eschatological ideas concerning the day of the Lord, the destruction of enemies, the deliverance of the people, the appearance of the Messiah, the consummation of the kingdom of God, and the like, and in the figure of the Messiah, as presented in the Old Testament, permits to come again fully to their rights even the supernatural traits, such as the miraculous birth (*Is.* vii. 14; *Mic.* v. 1), the divine names (*Is.* ix. 5) and so forth. Numerous texts and pericopes, which were considered post-exilic by the earlier critics, now again rank as genuine, and the so-called Christology of the Old Testament finds itself thus once more restored more or less fully to its rights and its value.

Perhaps there is no passage which more immediately suggests itself, when we ask after Old Testament testimonies to the transcendence of the Messiah than Daniel's account of his great vision of one like unto a Son of Man coming with the clouds of heaven (vii. 13, 14). So far as appears no doubt was felt as to the Messianic reference of this vision until modern times.<sup>82</sup> Even the Rationalists, as Hengstenberg points out,<sup>83</sup> though with strong temptations to reject it, yet for the most part recognized its Messianic character. And even up to the present day, when it has become the "Liberal" tradition<sup>84</sup> that, by the "one like unto a son of man", not the Messiah but the Israelitish people is intended, not only does the original Messianic interpretation still hold its own, but can be spoken of still by S. R. Driver, for example, as "the current interpretation".<sup>85</sup> Perhaps Hermann Schultz and Eduard Riehm may be taken as fair

<sup>82</sup> The solitary exceptions of Ephrem Syrus among the Church Fathers and of Abenezra among the Jews may be left out of account.

<sup>83</sup> *Christology*, iii, p. 83. He mentions De Wette, Bertholdt, Gesenius van Lengerke, Maurer.

<sup>84</sup> It is this that Sellin means when he says that the figure is "according to the dominant exposition simply a representation of the people of God" (*Heilandserwartung*, p. 70.)

<sup>85</sup> *The Book of Daniel* ("The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges") 1900, p. 102; cf. list of supporters of the two views on p. 108 note 4.

examples of how those "Liberals" who still cling to the interpretation of the vision of an individual, wish it to be understood. Schultz, who decides for this personal application only as probable, supposes<sup>86</sup> that Daniel conceived of the Messiah as a being dwelling with God in the heavens, like one of the angel-princes of whom he also speaks as like sons of men.<sup>87</sup> Riehm<sup>88</sup> will not allow even so much. He will not agree that there is in the vision any hint that the "one like unto a son of man" is of Divine or of angelic, or even in any sense of heavenly (as in Beyschlag's "heavenly man") nature. The prophet, he insists, gives no intimation of the origin of this Being, beyond the constant presupposition that he belongs with "the saints of the Most High". He is represented as being in heaven and coming thence "only because he is the representative and organ of the God of heaven", and a "superhuman character and a divine position and dignity" are thus "lent, as it were, to Him". That is to say we can learn from this passage only that this Being comes from God, in the sense that he is sent by God to do God's work in the world.

The element of truth in this reasoning lies in its refusal to separate the "one like unto a son of man" completely from humanity, as if he were presented as a purely heavenly Being, and thus dissevered wholly from the entire course of Messianic expectation heretofore, in which the Messiah uniformly appears in close connection with Israel from whom He springs. It is the more important to point out the inconsequence of the total transcendentalizing of the Messiah on the basis of this vision, that the novelty of the

---

<sup>86</sup> *Alttestamentliche Theologie*, 1896, pp. 635 f.

<sup>87</sup> This is probably the ruling view among those "Liberals" who allow the personal interpretation. For example, A. Schweitzer, writes (*The Expositor*, Nov. 1913, p. 444): "In the Book of Daniel the view is taken that there is no longer a ruling Davidic family from which a ruler could be raised up to be Messiah. The author, therefore, expects that God will confer the supreme power in the coming world-age on an angelic Being who possesses human form and has the appearance of a 'son of man' (Dan. vii. 13-14)."

<sup>88</sup> *Messianic Prophecy*, p. 196.

vision in the history of the Messianic expectation lies precisely in its throwing up the transcendental element of the Messianic figure into such a strong light as apparently to neglect, if not quite to obscure, its human side. "Now", writes Sellin,<sup>89</sup> "the expectation here presented to us is new in so far as this Future Ruler appears in Daniel absolutely as a heavenly Being, borne on clouds, standing before the heavenly throne of God; that there is complete silence as to His human derivation; that He, although He also has human traits, is a heavenly Being; that, on the other hand, all actual earthly traits such as are always attributed by the prophets to the Savior, because He is born into this world, are stripped off. In this expectation of Daniel's all and every earthly human being is transcended; the Savior comes no longer from this world, no matter how miraculously given by God, but wholly and exclusively from the transcendental world". This side of the matter may be capable thus of exaggeration, but it is clearly hopeless to represent a figure in any measure so presented to us, as wholly human, as Riehm would fain do. If it must be held that room is left for human traits not here insisted upon, the traits which are insisted upon are obviously distinctly superhuman, or, we should rather say, distinctly divine. This is already apparent from his representation as coming with (or on) the clouds. It is always the Lord, as Hengstenberg already pointed out,<sup>90</sup> who appears with, or on, the clouds of heaven; none but the Lord of nature can ride on the clouds of heaven; and the clouds, as Michaelis says, "are characteristic of divine majesty". Julius Grill is quite right when he throws into emphasis<sup>91</sup> that "majesty" is the one characteristic which is insisted upon in the "one like unto a son of man". He is not represented as coming

<sup>89</sup> *Heilandserwartung*, p. 72 f.

<sup>90</sup> *Christology*, III, 83: so also Pusey, *Daniel the Prophet*<sup>2</sup>, 1868, p. 85 f. Cf. Driver, *in loc.*: "with the clouds of heaven: in superhuman majesty and state."

<sup>91</sup> *Untersuchungen über die Entstehung des vierten Evangeliums*, I, 1902, p. 52.

from heaven to earth (Holsten, Appel), or as going from earth to heaven, or as coming out of obscurity into manifestation (H. Holtzmann). What he is represented as doing is simply drawing nigh to the throne. "What is emphasized in Daniel vii. 13 is the immediate vicinity of God into which the 'one like unto a son of man' is brought", says Grill, and compares Ps. cx. 1, and Jer. xxx. 21. "It is", he says again,<sup>92</sup> "a veritable coronation act which the author has seen and wishes to describe".

The investigation of the passage by Grill has apparently become the starting-point for a new movement of "Liberal" authors towards recognizing its reference to an individual figure. This does not appear to be due to any peculiar strength or special novelty in Grill's manner of prosecuting the discussion; the reasons which he presents for understanding the passage thus, are very much the same that have been repeatedly urged before. But he approaches the question from a new angle and his readers have been prepared to follow his suggestion by their participation in his general presuppositions. Grill himself thinks of a purely heavenly being as presented to us here, an angel, perhaps Michael, perhaps a higher Being still, "a most exalted personal intermediary between God and the world; and", he somewhat unexpectedly adds, "a transcendent prototype of the God-pleasing humanity ultimately to be realized in the people of the Most High". Nathaniel Schmidt had already<sup>93</sup> expressed a similar view, interpreting the man-like Being as an angel and more particularly as Michael, the guardian angel of Israel; and his view had attracted to itself Frank C. Porter.<sup>94</sup> In a later article<sup>95</sup> Schmidt restates his view, citing Grill in support of it in general, but declining to accept the somewhat incongruous addition by which Grill attempts to combine the two main interpretations of the passage—that the man-like Being is an exalted

<sup>92</sup> P. 54.

<sup>93</sup> *Journal of Biblical Literature*, xix, 1900.

<sup>94</sup> Hastings' *B.D.*, IV, p. 260.

<sup>95</sup> *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, 1903, p. 470 f.

heavenly personage and that he is the type of the saints of God. "Whether Michael or any other angel was ever thought of as the ideal Israelite", he declares to be doubtful. T. K. Cheyne<sup>96</sup> follows in Schmidt's steps, and, as was his wont, seeks to improve on him. Schmidt strongly repels the idea that Daniel's figure is the Messiah; to him this figure is distinctively a heavenly being,—angelic or more probably super-angelic, Michael or one higher still than Michael. To Cheyne,<sup>97</sup> he is both the Messiah, and "an angel, presumably Michael, the great prince-angel who defends the interests of the people of Israel,"—or rather Michael, the somewhat obscured representative of Marduk who was no angel but a God; in a word "a degraded (but an honorably degraded) deity", a "great superhuman (and originally divine) personage", "the heavenly Messiah" who, having played a great rôle in the creation of the world and the deliverance from Egypt (as the Angel of Jehovah) is in the last days to "redeem the world and mankind". In sharp contrast with Cheyne, Paul Volz,<sup>98</sup> while following Grill in rejecting the symbolical interpretation and seeing in the one "like unto a son of man" an individual being, is clear that Michael is not meant, nor any angelic being, but a simple man, the Lord-Messiah, the Lord of the new world, to whom is to be given the dominion of the world, and all the peoples and all the times. "He is certainly not the symbolical representative of the Kingdom of God, but the prince of this Kingdom. He is the representative (*Stellvertreter*) of God, to whom the power and honor and dominion belong; he stands, however, also in direct relation to the people of the seer, to the people Israel, his dominion is their dominion"—in short, he is the Messiah. Though he thus belongs to the category of man, he is not, however, forthwith to be assigned to the earthly sphere. He comes from heaven. The old myth of a primitive man comes into

---

<sup>96</sup> *Bible Problems*, 1904, pp. 213 ff.

<sup>97</sup> Pp. 73, 214, 222.

<sup>98</sup> *Jüdische Eschatologie*, 1903, pp. 101 f., 214 ff.

view here: a primitive man created as the opponent of the primitive beasts, the demonic monsters, who is to deliver the cosmos from them and secure the heavenly beings from their assaults. "This primitive Savior was brought forward, now, by the Apocalypticists for their eschatological purposes: Daniel recalls that man of whom the myth speaks and sees him in the vision; the Savior of the primitive age becomes the Savior of the last age, and the one as the other has to do with the beasts; the Apocalypse of Daniel, nevertheless, pays no further attention to the primitive existence of this man." According to Volz, then, Daniel's "one like unto a son of man" is, indeed, a transcendent being, but yet only a man, though a heavenly man: conceived on the lines of the primitive man and so far a reproduction of him; but not precisely that primitive man and therefore not necessarily preëxistent.

All this, now, Gressmann turns right as its head.<sup>99</sup> All investigators are agreed, says he with fine neglect of his colleagues, that in the text as it lies before us, the Man stands as a symbol of Israel, as the beasts do of the heathen kingdoms. But this is only a use to which Daniel has put a borrowed figure: "the originality of the reworker consists only in this—that he has reinterpreted the Man of Israel". Whatever else there is in the passage, we may safely employ for the reconstruction of the old myth, and adventuring on this path we find in the Man a parallel figure to the Messiah, who, according to the old Israelitish conception, was to stand at the beginning of the new age and all the peoples be subject to Him. He is, no doubt, an angel, but no common angel, the highest angel rather, the Being who is the greatest of all, next after only the Ancient of Days; hence He is not Gabriel or Michael—they are not high enough. We cannot give Him a name; we must be modest and say merely that this angel means that eschatological figure, whom everybody knows as the eschatological man which in the end of the days is to be made the Lord of the

---

<sup>99</sup> *Der Ursprung, usw.* p. 340.

world. In the heathen form of this myth, which lies behind the Jewish one, He was, of course, a God; and this God has only been degraded into an angel in consequence of Jewish monotheism. It was as an angel therefore that He came to Daniel; and Daniel turned Him into a symbol of Israel. The development thus proceeded in directly the opposite direction from what is commonly thought. Israel is not here represented as one like unto a son of man; but the man is represented as Israel.

Sellin<sup>100</sup> makes it his primary task to draw the teeth of Gressmann's mythology. He takes his start frankly from Gressmann's findings. It is true enough, he says, that the Messianic conception is wider than that of the Son of David; wider and older. We may see proofs of this all through the prophets. Witness what we are told in them of the birth of Immanuel from the Almah who was with child, of the travail of the Yoledhah, of the seven shepherds and eight princes of the fifth chapter of Micah, of the "Mighty God" and other great names of the ninth chapter of Isaiah, above all of the eating of milk and honey, the picture of the King of Paradise riding on the ass, and the like.<sup>101</sup> But why represent these things as borrowed goods? Why, above all, think of Daniel's Man, who certainly was not invented by Daniel, but was already known to his readers, as a recent importation from heathendom? Rather, Daniel throws himself back on the prophets before him where we may find these things fragmentarily alluded to; as, for example, in Isaiah, and everywhere in the Old

<sup>100</sup> In Sellin's view, Dan. vii. 13, in the original Biography of Daniel, "referred to the proclamation of the Saviour as the Second Adam, as a heavenly man, free from all that is earthly, and to His kingdom"; but the later author of the Apocalypse of Daniel—that is, our Daniel—has transferred this to the whole people of God. So he explains in *Prophetismus*, p. 97, note 1. In the discussion in *Heilandserwartung*, pp. 70 ff., he deals with Daniel's presentation of "one like unto a son of man" as an individual figure without raising question of the composition of the passage.

<sup>101</sup> *Die alttestamentliche Religion im Rahmen der anderen altorientalischen*, 1908, p. 45.

Israelitish expectations of a Being coming out of the Divine sphere. What we have in Daniel is not something new to Israel, but the primaevial Jewish expectation of a Savior newborn, stripped of this-world traits, and transformed into the sphere of the transcendental world.<sup>102</sup>

So, the discussion goes on. But it does not remain without results. And the main result of it is, that assurance is rendered doubly sure that in the "one like unto a son of man" of Dan. vii. 13, we have a superhuman figure, a figure to whose superhuman character justice is not done until it is recognized as expressly divine. It was understood to be a superhuman figure by everyone who appealed to it and built his Messianic hopes upon its basis throughout the whole subsequent development of the Jewish Church.<sup>103</sup> Wherever, in the Apocalyptic literature we meet with the figure of the Son of Man, it is transcendently conceived.<sup>104</sup> When our Lord Himself derived from it His favorite self-designation of Son of Man,<sup>105</sup> He too took it over in a transcendental sense; and meant by applying it to Himself to present Himself as a heavenly Being who had come forth from heaven and descended to earth on a mission of mercy to lost men. On every occasion on which our Lord called Himself the Son of Man thus, He bears His witness to the transcendental character of the figure presented to Daniel. There is no reason apparent today why His judgment of the seer's meaning

<sup>102</sup> *Heilandserwartung*, pp. 70 ff.

<sup>103</sup> Cf. A. Dillmann, *Alttest. Theologie*, p. 538: "Finally the whole exegetical tradition from the Book of Enoch (which is directly dependent on Daniel) on, has ever understood by this title the king of the kingdom. I cannot help holding that this interpretation is right. In this case we have not only the beginning of the development of the earthly kingdom of God into a βασιλεῖα τῶν οὐρανῶν here, but also its head is designated as like an angelic being (for these are elsewhere in Daniel also designated בָּנֵי נְשׁוֹן בָּנְיָה), a preexistent Being present already in heaven who in the fulness of the times will come and establish the eternal kingdom of heaven."

<sup>104</sup> Cf. W. Bousset, *Religion des Judentums*<sup>1</sup>, p. 24 ff. (In ed. 2, pp. 301 f. the more relevant part of this statement is eliminated).

<sup>105</sup> Cf. H. J. Holtzmann, *Neutestament. Theologie*<sup>1</sup>, I, p. 247: "The

should be revised. If by his "one like to a son of man" Daniel meant to bring before us the figure of an individual being, and that seems to us to be beyond question,—it is very certain that the individual the figure of whom he brings before us is superhuman, or rather Divine.

In attempting to illustrate the testimony of the Old Testament to the deity of the Messiah we have laid particular stress on the great declarations in Ps. xlv. 6, Is. ix. 6 and Dan. vii. 13. These are, as we have said, high lights shining out brightly on the surface of a pervasive implication. They are not the only points which shine out on its surface with special brilliancy. We might just as well have chosen to dwell, instead, on Ps. ii. or Ps. cx. or Mic. v. 2, or Jer. xxiii. 6 or Zech. xiii. 7 or Mal. iii. 1, and the like.<sup>106</sup> A selection, however, had to be made and we have endeavored to select those particular points on which the light seemed to shine with the purest illumination. We should be sorry to leave the impression, however, that the testimony of the Old Testament to the Deity of the Messiah is dependent upon these particular passages, and their fellows. The salient fact regarding it is that it is an essential element in the eschatological system of the Old Testament and is inseparably imbedded in the hope of the coming of God to His kingdom which formed the heart of Israelitish religion from its origin. We have only to free ourselves from the notion that the Messianic hope was the product of the monarchy and to realize that, however closely it becomes attached to the Davidic dynasty in one of its modes of ex-

reference of the term back to Dan. vii. 13 (already essayed by expositors of the Reformation period like Chemnitz and recommended by Ewald and Hitzig) is to-day the, at all events, most recognized and most assured result of the discussions of the 'Son of Man', vexed in so many points."

<sup>106</sup> E. König, *Offenbarungsbegriff*, II, p. 398, illustrating how the light of salvation breaks now and again through the veil of Old Testament conceptions, by which it is covered in the Old Testament announcements, observes (among other things) that "the superhumanness of the mediator grows ever clearer (Is. ix. 6 ff., xi. 1 ff.; Mat. v. 1)." Cf. Ottley, Hastings' *B.D.*, III, p. 459 f.

pression, it was an aboriginal element in the religion of Israel, to understand how little it can be summed up in the expectation of the coming of an earthly king. It is one of the chief merits of the new school of research that it is making this ever more and more clear.

Meanwhile, it is an unhappy fact that we may search in vain through many of the current treatises on the Messianic hope for intimations that it included the promise of a Divine Redeemer. It is much, indeed, if we find a hearty recognition that a Messianic figure occupied an essential place in it; at least during the larger space of the history of Israelitish religion. Even devout-minded students have been sometimes tempted to represent Messianic prophecy as fulfilled "not so much in the personality and work of Christ as in the religion of Christ".<sup>107</sup> When the person of the Messiah is given its rights, however, as the center of Messianic prophecy, it is still often insisted that He was conceived purely as a human being,—as Trypho, Justin Martyr's collocutor in the famous dialogue, contended in the second century. At the best, we get such a concession as A. Dillmann's. "We have then," says he,<sup>108</sup> "in this whole series of Messianic prophesies certainly the portrait of a sovereign of the kingdom, endowed with Divine attributes and powers, but nowhere a God or God-man; on the other hand, however, the Book of Daniel advances to a still higher, metaphysical or mystical view of His nature . . . an already existing being preexisting in the heavens, who in the fulness of the times comes and establishes the kingdom of the saints."<sup>109</sup> On this A.B. Davidson makes less than no advance, when he declares<sup>110</sup>—shall we not say, evidently not without some misgivings?—"In Is. ix. xi. it is not taught that Messiah is God, but that Jehovah is fully present

<sup>107</sup> Cf. F. H. Woods, *The Hope of Israel*, 1896.

<sup>108</sup> *Alttestament. Theologie*, pp. 538-9.

<sup>109</sup> The schematization of the Messianic hope worked out from this point of view is very clearly presented by C. F. Kent, *The Sermons, etc., of Israel's Prophets*, 1910, pp. 45-47.

<sup>110</sup> Hastings' *B.D.*, IV, p. 124 f.; similarly, *Old Testament Prophecy*, 1903, pp. 367-8.

in Him. The general eschatological idea was that the presence of Jehovah in person among men would be their salvation. The prophet gives a particular turn to that general idea, representing that Jehovah shall be present in the Davidic king. The two are not identified but Jehovah is fully manifested in the Messiah." The sufficient answer to such comments is that they are obviously minimizing in intention; they are endeavors not to concede too much where concession is seen to be nevertheless necessary. We do not wonder that Davidson feels constrained to add: "The passage goes very far". Pity it is that he could not see his way to go the whole length that it goes.

Happily, however, there have always been some who, standing less under the blight of the current critical theories, have been able to see more clearly. Thus, for example, F. Godet has seen his way to declare<sup>111</sup> that "the idea of the Divinity of the Messiah" is "the soul of the entire Old Testament"; and, after adducing Isaiah's designation of Him as "Wonderful", "Mighty God", and Micah's discrimination of His historical birth at Bethlehem from His prehistoric birth "from everlasting", and Malachi's calling Him "Adhonai coming to His temple", to sum up in these sentences: "There was in the whole of the Old Testament from the patriarchal theophanies down to the latest prophetic visions, a constant current towards the incarnation as the goal of all these revelations. The appearance of the Messiah presents itself more and more clearly to the view of the prophets as the perfect theophany, the final coming of Jehovah." It is upon this thread of Old Testament teaching, he goes on to remark—broken off in the Rabbinical development—that Jesus laid hold in His assertion of the dignity of His person as Messiah. These words might well have been written today; they express admirably the new insight which we have obtained unto the nature and development of Old Testament eschatology.

*Princeton.*

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

---

<sup>111</sup> *Commentary on Luke*, E. T., II, p. 251.

## SUGGESTIONS OF THE SURVEY PARTY REGARDING BIBLICAL SITES

The survey of western Palestine was begun in the late autumn of the year 1871. Preliminary reconnaissances of parts of the country had been previously made by Captain Anderson and Captain Warren of the Royal Engineers, and Major Wilson had completed the Ordnance Survey of the neighborhood of Jerusalem, with the line of levels from the Mediterranean to the Dead Sea and from Jerusalem to Solomon's Pools. Upon the decision of the Palestine Exploration Fund to survey the entire country west of the Jordan, the work was entrusted to Captain Stewart, R. E. His staff consisted of two men, non-commissioned officers of the Royal Engineers and trained surveyors, Sergeant Black and Corporal Armstrong; and Mr. C. F. Tyrwhitt Drake was appointed as linguist and archaeologist to the expedition. Captain Stewart arrived at Jaffa early in November, 1871, but severe illness shortly after his arrival compelled him to return to England. Mr. Drake, however, was able to take temporary charge, and the work progressed. Lieutenant Claude Reigner Conder, R. E., who had just finished his military education at Chatham and was not quite twenty-four years of age, was appointed to the command of the expedition. He arrived in Palestine on July 8, 1872, and, with the exception of an absence of four months, worked continuously until the end of September, 1875, when he returned to England, having surveyed forty-seven hundred square miles. The remaining thirteen hundred square miles of the survey of western Palestine were finished in 1877 by Lieutenant Kitchener, who had joined the party in November 1874.<sup>1</sup> Mr. George

---

<sup>1</sup> Quarterly Statement, 1872, pp. 2 ff. and 34, 102, cp. 153; Tent Work in Palestine, vol. i. pp. vii., xiv., xv.; Memoirs, vol. i. 18 and 23-28; Palestine, pp. 19 and 31.

Armstrong, who went out with the expedition in 1871 and returned with Captain Conder in 1875, was also a member of the party, under the command of Captain Conder, which conducted a survey in eastern Palestine in the late summer and early autumn of 1881. Some years later a part of the country east of the Jordan in the north was surveyed for the committee by Herr Gottlieb Schumacher, of the German colony at Haifa.<sup>2</sup> To the labors of these men biblical scholarship already owes much and will be lastingly indebted.

In 1878 Lieutenant Conder published two volumes entitled "Tent Work in Palestine", in which he states that of the places west of the Jordan mentioned in the Old Testament, Apocrypha, and New Testament "434 are identified with reasonable certainty", and of these "172 are discoveries due to the Survey" (vol. ii. p. 334). At least thirty-six of these one hundred and seventy-two proposed identifications were, however, abandoned at once.<sup>3</sup> Two years later, in "A Handbook to the Bible", he gives a list of "840 places in the Holy Land" and notes that "500 have been recovered either with certainty or with great probability, and of these 140,<sup>4</sup> marked by an asterisk(\*), are not shown on previous maps" (p. 400). "Palestine," in the series known as "The World's Great Explorers and Explorations",

<sup>2</sup> Quarterly Statements, 1882, pp. x. 1; 1886, p. 1; Survey of Eastern Palestine, vol. i. p. v.; Palestine, p. 20.

<sup>3</sup> In the "Handbook to the Bible" the site is declared to be unknown of the town called Ashan and the two known as Ashnah, Baal and Balah, Beth-berei, Beth-car, Cabbon, Chor-ashan, Eder, En-hakkore and Ramath-lehi, Ephes-dammim, Gomorrah, Hadattah and Hazor-hadattah, Hazar-gaddah, Hormah and Zephath, Zelah, Zuph. Later a new site is proposed for Ashnah of Josh. xv. 33.

The names of Asher, Cola, Hali, and Shahazimah are allowed silently to drop out of notice. Cola and Hali, however, are revived in "Names and Places", and are there starred.

A different site is adopted in the Topographical Index of the "Handbook" for Aphek of 1 Sam. iv. 1, Baalah, Kirjath-baal and Kirjath-jearim (Soba being abandoned), Baal-hamon, Bered, Bezeth, Hezron and Kerioth-hezron, Ummah.

<sup>4</sup> 141 are so marked.

was published in 1889. In it Major Conder says that out of "422 names of towns, valleys, mountains, streams, and springs in Palestine mentioned in the Old Testament [and Apocrypha], and now identified on the ground, those marked †, which amount to 144 in all,<sup>5</sup> were discovered by the present author" (p. 262). This number is so nearly the same as that given in the "Handbook to the Bible", that it might be supposed that the two lists are in virtual agreement. This is not the case, however. Many names found in the "Handbook" have been discarded,<sup>6</sup> and many identifications are proposed which are not included in the previous lists. In another book of the year 1889, entitled "Names and Places in the Old and New Testament and Apocrypha, with their modern identifications", compiled by Mr. George Armstrong, revised by Colonel Sir Charles W. Wilson and Major Conder, and published for the Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund, "the identifications suggested by Major Conder as due to the Survey are marked with a star." One hundred and forty-six names from the Old Testament and the Apocrypha are marked by this sign, reckoning duplicates but once. Fourteen other identifications, claimed by Major Conder in his "Palestine" as his own, are included in Mr. Armstrong's list, but are not distinguished by an asterisk as identifications due to the Survey.<sup>7</sup> For convenience, these fourteen names may be

---

<sup>5</sup> Only 141 names are marked in this way in the list.

<sup>6</sup> The following fourteen are starred in the Topographical Index of the "Handbook", but are not even listed in "Palestine": Aphek of 1 Sam. iv. 1 and Aphek of 1 Sam. xxix, 1, Ataroth of Josh. xvi. 7, Berea, Bezek of Judg. i. 5, Diblath, Ebenezer, Elon, Enam, Esora (Judith iv. 4), Gibeath ha-Elohim (1 Sam. x. 5), Kibzaim, Zair, Zartanah.

And these nine, which appear in the "Handbook" but are not starred, have vanished from sight, not being listed in "Palestine": Baal-tamar, Belmain or Belmen, Bered, Bezeth, Bileam, Bozez, Caphar-salama, Idalah, Mount Seir (Josh. xv. 10). Several of these twenty-three names will reappear later, in the catalogue compiled by Mr. George Armstrong.

<sup>7</sup> Beth-dagon in Asher, Debir on the northern border of Judah, Hazar-susah, Janum, Joktheel, Kedesh (Judg. iv. 11), Madmen, Maha-

added to the one hundred and forty-six, and also eight identifications proposed by Major Conder, but rejected in Mr. Armstrong's list, may be included,<sup>8</sup> and the resulting one hundred and sixty-eight be made the subject of a general examination.

The Biblical scholar at once asks how far these one hundred and sixty-eight proposed identifications fulfil the conditions of a satisfactory identification. For in order to identify a site with any degree of certainty, apart from the proof afforded by the remains themselves and brought to light by excavation, four lines of evidence should concur: a location in the land corresponding to the Biblical indications; natural objects and characteristics of the place like those perchance alluded to in the Scriptures; a name perpetuating the ancient name; and, if possible, a mention of the place in early records, with specific measurements and other information regarding distance and relative position, as in the "Onomasticon" of Eusebius or the Egyptian and Assyrian records.<sup>9</sup> Even these indications are not infallible, otherwise Lachish might still be sought as

---

neh-dan, Mozah, Ramah of Asher, Rock Seneh, Shaaraim, Thimnathah, Zareth-shahar. Of these, all except Debir, Madmen, Ramah, and Zareth-shahar had already been suggested in the "Handbook to the Bible".

<sup>8</sup> Beth-haccherem, Gallim, Is. x. 30, ascent of Horonaim, Minnith, Mizpeh of Benjamin, Penuel, cliff of Peor, mount Salmon.

<sup>9</sup> Lieutenant Conder says: "The sites are in all cases, as far as I have been able to make out, suitable, in relative position as regards other places mentioned in connection with them. The name is naturally the deciding indication, and in cases where the name is not radically the same, the reasons which lead to the proposed identification will generally be found in the text" (*Tent Work*, ii. 333, cp. 65).

"The identifications . . . depend either on the survival of the ancient name in an Aramaic or Arabic form at the present day at the site, or on the accordance between measured distances and those given by the authorities cited, including the works of Josephus, the Talmud, and the Onomasticon of Eusebius" (*Handbook*, p. 400).

"When the Hebrew and the Arabic are shown to contain the same radicals, the same gutterals, and often the same meanings, we have a truly reliable comparison" (*Palestine*, p. 219).

formerly at Umm Lakis (as by van de Velde)<sup>10</sup>; nevertheless these are the tests to which every proposed identification must be subjected.<sup>11</sup>

On comparing the list published by Major Conder in his book entitled "Palestine", the list drawn up on behalf of the Palestine Exploration Fund by Mr. George Armstrong, and the remarks by Major Conder which accompany Mr. Armstrong's list, a group of proposed identifications is readily discovered among the one hundred and sixty-eight about which neither Mr. Armstrong nor Major Conder ex-

---

<sup>10</sup> Memoir to Accompany the Map of the Holy Land constructed by C. W. M. van de Velde, section ix. pp. 280-356.

<sup>11</sup> The suggestions made by the members of the Survey have been before the public for thirty-five years and more, and have received attentive consideration in the comprehensive studies of Biblical geography which have been made during that time. The writer of the present note published the results of his investigation in his "Dictionary of the Bible", first issued in 1894. The material was canvassed by Professor Frants Buhl for his "Geographie des alten Palästina", 1896, and was fully covered by Professor Hermann Guthe, who wrote the geographical articles for his "Kurzes Bibelwörterbuch", published in 1903. Dr. Alphonse Legende, professor in the seminary at Mans, has expressed his judgment in Vigouroux' "Dictionnaire de la Bible", 1895-1912, in the course of his articles on the tribes of Israel and again in most instances in a special article on each name. Professor George Adam Smith, in his "Historical Geography of the Holy Land", 1894, has touched upon a number of the suggestions made by members of the Survey, and in the splendid "Atlas of the Historical Geography of the Holy Land", 1915, prepared by him in collaboration with Dr. J. G. Bartholomew, almost all of the sites which figure in the proposed identifications are marked, and a judgment on the satisfactoriness of the identification is in most cases expressed, while in others it may perhaps be assumed to be implied. The "Atlas" is less critical than the other works referred to, but with this exception these investigators are in substantial agreement in their judgment regarding each of the suggestions made by the members of the Survey and regarding the finality of the proposed identifications.

The latest opinion of Colonel Conder regarding most of the identifications proposed in his previous works is expressed in geographical articles in "The Illustrated Bible Dictionary", published in 1908; and a number of articles (as far as Remeth) were written by Major Conder for Hastings' "Dictionary of the Bible", the volumes of which appeared during the years 1898-1902.

presses any doubt. The names number thirty.<sup>12</sup> The statements are positive, without any hint of the possibility of error or that the identification is merely probable. In other writings, however, especially in articles written later for dictionaries of the Bible, Major, afterwards Colonel, Conder speaks more cautiously of many of these thirty identifications.<sup>13</sup> How probable, then, are these thirty? How sound are the reasons advanced for them? Are the four criteria of name, location, character of the site, and early references satisfied, so as to raise a strong presumption; or are only some of these conditions met? Is it the Biblical site itself which has been located, or only the place later pointed out as the site? The village of *Abel-meholah*, to quote Captain Conder's words in the second volume of the "Memoirs"

<sup>12</sup> Abel-meholah, Adummim, Ataroth-addar, Beth-eked, Eleasa, Gederah of Judah, Naamah, plain of Nasor, Ramoth, Rock Seneh, Timnah of Judah, Timnath-heres, Tirzah, valley of Zephathah. The remaining sixteen are listed in the next footnote.

<sup>13</sup> In articles in Hastings' "Dictionary of the Bible", 1898-1902, and "The Illustrated Bible Dictionary", 1908, he used words like probably and perhaps. In the "Memoirs" of the Survey, 1881-1883, also Captain Conder shows caution regarding some of the towns of this group for which he did not furnish articles for Hastings' "Dictionary of the Bible"; and including two articles in that dictionary which were written by prominent colleagues of Captain Conder in the Survey, more than half of the proposed identifications in this group are ultimately found to be offered not as certain, but as probable or possible. Thus in Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible, Adamah, Adami, Archi, Hannathon, Horem, Jeshanah, Rabbith, of all of which the identification is said to be probable; Arab, perhaps; Bezek (1 Sam. xi. 8) the most likely site; Dabbesheth, may be. In the "Memoirs": Rakkon (vol. ii. 63), Gederah of Benjamin (vol. iii. 10), Gibeah of Judah (vol. iii. 25), and Debir, Josh. xv. 49, (vol. iii. 402). In articles written for Hastings' "Dictionary of the Bible" by his colleagues; Jabneel (C. Warren, "no clew"), Sela-hammahlekoth (C. W. Wilson, "suitable"). In addition to these sixteen, Colonel Conder, speaking of three towns mentioned in footnote 12, calls the site proposed for Beth-eked probable, and that for Tirzah the most probable; and he declares that the site proposed by him earlier for Gederah of Judah is doubtful (Illustrated Bible Dictionary).

In other words out of one hundred and sixty-eight suggested identifications only about fourteen, and on closer examination still fewer, are without a note of caution.

(ii. 231), "is identified in the Onomasticon with a place 10 miles south of Scythopolis, called Bethaula (Βηθμαελά). The distance brings us to 'Ain Helweh, the name of which contains the proper radicals, and the position seems not discordant with the notice in the Bible (Judges vii. 22)". In accordance with these data, obtained from the Scriptures and Eusebius, Abel-meholah has, of course, heretofore been located in this immediate neighborhood, in or near Wady el-Maleh, and still is;<sup>14</sup> and full assent is readily given by all investigators to Captain Conder's statement, except to the assertion that the word Helweh "contains the proper radicals" to represent Meholah. In etymology and meaning the two names are entirely different. Unhesitating assent is likewise given to Captain Conder's statement concerning *Bezek* when, in speaking of the ruin Ibzik, seven miles west-northwest of 'Ain el-Helweh, he says: "Ibzik . . . is unquestionably a Bezek known to Eusebius, [one of the two neighboring villages of the name, seventeen Roman miles from Neapolis towards Scythopolis], and probably the place where Saul collected his army before attacking the Ammonites (1 Sam. xi. 8)." <sup>15</sup> "Name, situation, and distance suit" (Guthe). Concerning the ascent of *Adummim*, on the boundary between the territories of Judah and Benjamin, it is stated that "the name is exactly represented by the Arabic Tal'at ed Dumm, [ascent of blood], and the position south of Wady Kelt and about half way to Jerusalem appears to fit well".<sup>16</sup> There is entire agreement among students of the historical geography

<sup>14</sup> 'Ain el-Helweh, the sweet spring, is in Wady el-Helweh, about one third of a mile south of its junction with Wady el-Maleh, and a mile and a half east by south of 'Ain el-Maleh, the salt spring. A mile and a half to the north, where Wady esh-Shukk enters the Wady el-Maleh, van de Velde placed Abel-meholah.<sup>10</sup> Three quarters of a mile still farther north is another spring of sweet water, also bearing the name 'Ain el-Helweh.

<sup>15</sup> Tent Work in Palestine, i. 108; cp. Survey of Western Palestine: Memoirs, ii. 231.

<sup>16</sup> Survey of Western Palestine: Memoirs, iii. 172.

of the Holy Land that the ancient name is echoed here, under this form. For many years it has been recognized in Kal'at ed Dumm, a ruined castle on the summit of the ascent, "without doubt the lofty Adummim of the Bible".<sup>17</sup> The original name was probably suggested by the red strata in the rocks.<sup>18</sup> Regarding the border of the *Archites* (Josh. xvi. 2), the statement made in the "Memoirs" (iii. 7) is carefully worded: "'Ain 'Arik . . . is probably Archi on the boundary of Benjamin, between Bethel and Beth-horon." The identification is "not certain" (Buhl), it is advanced in the "Memoirs" as probable. The location suits better than the name for the initial consonant is not the same in the Hebrew and Arabic names.<sup>19</sup> Regarding *Jeshanah*, Captain Conger says: "The name and position [of 'Ain Sinia] suggests the identity of the place with Jeshanah, a town noticed as taken from Jeroboam together with Bethel and Ephraim (2 Chron. xiii. 19)".<sup>20</sup> 'Ain Sinia is situated three miles and a half north of Bethel. Its identification with Jeshanah was proposed by M. Clermont-Ganneau, and has been most favorably received.<sup>21</sup> As to the town of *Debir*, in the hill country of Judah (Josh. xv. 49), Captain Conder says: "There seems to be every reason for sup-

<sup>17</sup> E. G. Schultz, quoted in Ritter's "Comparative Geography of Palestine and the Sinaitic Peninsula", English translation, 1865, vol. iii. 10; see also van de Velde, "Memoir to Accompany the Map", p. 282.

<sup>18</sup> Kitto, "Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature", 1845, article Adummim.

<sup>19</sup> The "Atlas" of Smith and Bartholomew, however, accepts the identification without question. So, too, does Legendre in the "Dictionnaire de la Bible" (ii. 1874); but elsewhere in the "Dictionnaire", in an unsigned article, the identification is spoken of as probable (i. 932). The difference in the initial consonants, aleph in the Hebrew word and ain in the Arabic, is not a fatal objection to the identity of the place, as is illustrated somewhat poorly by the name Ashkelon.

<sup>20</sup> Survey of Western Palestine: Memoirs, ii. 291; Name Lists, p. 224.

<sup>21</sup> Clermont-Ganneau in "Journal asiatique", 1877, pp. 490 ff. Like Buhl, and Conder in Hastings' "Dictionary of the Bible", Socin says "probably" (Baedeker 187); Davis and Guthe mention, and Guthe in his article on Sen explicitly accepts; F. Vigouroux seems to accept (iii. 1397); and the "Atlas" accepts the identification with Isana (p. 23 and index), that is, with Jeshanah (pp. 12, 32-37, 39-42).

posing Dhâheriyeh, [a name interpreted as "the village on the ridge, or the 'apparent village'"<sup>22</sup>], to be the ancient Debir, a place not identified before the Survey. The name has the same meaning, derived from its situation on the 'back' of a long ridge; and the position between Shochoh (Shuweikeh), Dannah (Idhnah), Anab ('Anâb), and Eshtemoa (Es Semû'a), seems very suitable (Josh. xv. 48)."<sup>23</sup> This village, which lies a little more than eleven miles to the southwest of Hebron, is "probably the site of ancient Debir".<sup>24</sup> This identification, however, "rests upon a mistaken interpretation of the name Debir";<sup>25</sup> but yet it is decidedly the best suggestion that has been made. The situation is almost in the center of the group of towns in the midst of which it is named; and it is not more than seven miles from any one of them, so far as they have been reasonably identified. The "Atlas" adopts the identification without a query; but Professor Smith in his "Historical Geography of the Holy Land" (p. 279) speaks of it only as probable, and so also does Legendre (ii. 1200; similarly iii. 1763). The identification of *the rock Seneh* is reasonably certain (see section iv). For *Sela-hammahlekoth*, the rock of divisions, a cliff in the wilderness of Maon, to the southeast of Hebron, where Saul was providentially led to withdraw from the pursuit of David, Captain Conder proposes the gorge of Wady Malâki as "a suitable position".<sup>26</sup> The suitability of the location and of the character of the ravine are gladly conceded; and the detour which the gorge of Wady Malâki would compel Saul to make might explain the ability of David to put the mountain between himself and Saul (1 Sam. xxiii. 24-29).<sup>27</sup> But these things are far

<sup>22</sup> Survey of Western Palestine: Name Lists, p. 429.

<sup>23</sup> Tent Work in Palestine, ii. 93.

<sup>24</sup> Survey of Western Palestine: Memoirs, iii. 402.

<sup>25</sup> Sayce in Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible; Legendre, ii. 1199.

<sup>26</sup> Survey of Western Palestine: Memoirs, iii. 314; Tent Work in Palestine, ii. 91 f.

<sup>27</sup> Too much stress is perhaps laid on the word *sela'*, rock, in "Tent Work in Palestine", ii. 91 f. For usage, it is enough to compare Num. xx. 8; Judg. vi. 20, xv. 8, xx. 45.

from establishing identity, although they are favorable to it; and decided exception must be taken to the suggestion that the name Malâki "may be a corruption of the Hebrew by the loss of a guttural",<sup>28</sup> namely heth.

General recognition as being at least worthy of consideration, though more or less lacking in proof, is accorded the identification suggested for *Beth-eked*<sup>29</sup> or the "shearing-house" (2 Kin. x. 12), *Elasa*, *Gederah of Benjamin*,<sup>30</sup> *Rabbith*, and *Rakkon*. More questionable are the identifications proposed for *Arab*, *Hannathon*, and *Jabneel* the frontier town of Naphtali.

Regarding the remaining fourteen towns of this group of thirty, there is great unanimity in the judgment of the investigators who have been mentioned<sup>11</sup> that the proposed identifications are groundless. The suggestion of the Surveyors is rarely mentioned, usually it is ignored or fatal objections to it are pointed out or the brief statement is made that the place has not been identified.<sup>31</sup> Major Conder, in

<sup>28</sup> Survey of Western Palestine: Memoirs, iii. 314; Illustrated Bible Dictionary; and C. W. Wilson in Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible.

<sup>29</sup> This suggested identification is not due to the Survey. Measured along the natural route, by way of Jenin, Beit Kad is situated fifteen Roman miles from Legio, the distance given in the Onomasticon for Baithachath, which is identified by Jerome with the shearing-house, 2 Kin. x. 12. Beit Kad, however, is not on the road from Jezreel to Samaria, but lies three miles to the east of Jenin. Traveling from Jezreel "Jehu on the way to Samaria could not well arrive there" (Thenius, in 1849, commenting on 2 Kin. x. 12).

<sup>30</sup> I Chron. xii. 4. The context seems to require a town in the territory of Benjamin, and as Gibeon has just been mentioned the suggestion is suitable that the place is still represented by Jedireh, three quarters of a mile northeast of el-Jib (Gibeon). Too much confidence, however, should not be placed in the fact that the two names Jedireh and Gederah are identical.

<sup>31</sup> Thirteen identifications are rejected: Adamah with ed-Dâmieh, and Adami with the ruin Admah; Ataroth-addar with ed-Dârieh, Dabbesheth with Dabsheh; also the identifications proposed for Gederah, Gibeah, and Timnah of Judah; for Horem, Naamah, Ramoth of Issachar, Timnath-heres, Tirzah and the valley of Zephathah. The "Atlas" of Smith and Bartholomew accepts Gederah, Gibeah, and Timnah of Judah, Naamah, and the valley of Zephathah.

For the plain of Nasor read with the R. V. plain of Hazor.

his later articles in Hastings' "Dictionary of the Bible" and "The Illustrated Bible Dictionary", returns to his earlier opinion, expressed in "Tent Work in Palestine", p. 334, and identifies *Adamah* with the ruin Admah, and *Adami* with ed-Dâmieh. The "Atlas" of Smith and Bartholomew is alone in accepting ed-Dâmieh as the site of Adamah, but it queries this identification in the index; and Professor Smith in his "Historical Geography of the Holy Land", p. 396, note 1, speaks of ed-Dâmieh, not as the site of Adamah, but "perhaps the *Adami* of Josh. xix. 33". *Gederah of Judah* was in the lowland; and a ruin known as Khurbet Jedireh is in the lowland, three miles and a half southeast of Gezer, in the territory afterwards assigned to the tribe of Dan. But its situation is apart from the towns with which it is grouped in the book of Joshua (xv. 33-36), and the enumeration of the towns seems to be moving steadily southward, placing Gederah far away from the ruin Jedireh. Moreover the word *Gederah*, meaning enclosure, sheepfold, like *Gibeah*, a hill, and *Ramah*, a height, denotes an object so common that the name does not furnish a safe clue to an identification. Colonel Conder finally said, "The site is doubtful", and argued against his former identification with the ruin Jedireh.<sup>32</sup> That *Gibeah of Judah* is represented by *Jeb'a*, eight miles west by south of Bethlehem, is not a new suggestion, but was made long ago by van de Velde.<sup>10</sup> The village, however, lies outside the group in which *Gibeah* is mentioned (Josh. xv. 55-57). Yet notwithstanding the inappropriateness of the situation involved in the identification proposed for *Gibeah*, and also in that proposed for *Timnah of Judah*, a fact that should not be wholly ignored favors these identifications (see, in this article, section iv. 5). The situation is also against the sites suggested for *Naamah* and *Ramoth of Issachar*. Sir Charles W. Wilson considers Teiâsîr, the site proposed by Captain Conder for *Tirzah*,<sup>33</sup> to be "too far north to suit

<sup>32</sup> Article in the Illustrated Bible Dictionary.

<sup>33</sup> Survey of Western Palestine: Memoirs ii. 228.

2 Kin. xv. 14."<sup>34</sup> Regarding *Horem* Major Conder in his article on the town in Hastings' "Dictionary of the Bible" abandoned his identification of it with the ruin Hârah, seven miles northwest of Kedesh-naphtali, and favored "the modern Hûrah, west of Kedesh-naphtali", an identification suggested by van de Velde, and "which appears on the [Survey] map as Kh. el-Kurah", ten miles west of Kedesh.<sup>35</sup> But later Colonel Conder again advanced the ruin Hârah, three miles north of 'Ainîtha, as the probable site.<sup>32</sup>

There remain now some one hundred and thirty-nine names. The suggested sites are offered cautiously in one or another of the publications of the Palestine Exploration Fund; and the brief discussion of them which now follows, and of some which received but a bare mention in the preceding section, aims simply to exhibit the basis upon which they rest. They are treated in groups, each being assigned to that group which seemed most appropriate, although at times a different assignment would not have been unsuitable.

I. Identifications which in each case are but a mere surmise in a large field, the suggestion of a site believed to be suitable but for which substantial reasons are lacking. The particular location proposed by the members of the Survey for the site of *Mahaneh-dan* and for the sites, east of the Jordan, of *Bamoth-baal*, *Beth-peor*, the field of *Zophim*, *Horonaim*, *Penuel*, and the top of *Peor* have not commanded acceptance, and in Mr. Armstrong's list the last three, Horonaim, Penuel, and the top of Peor, are stated to be "not identified". Five other suggestions in a wide field for search deserve more extended comment. *Ramoth-gilead*: no agreement has been reached among exegetes whether its site should be sought north or south of the Jabbok. If north, then the town of Reimun, as Major

<sup>34</sup> Article in Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible.

<sup>35</sup> Memoir to Accompany the Map, p. 322; Survey of Western Palestine: Memoirs, i. 205; Tent Work in Palestine, ii. 337; and Vigouroux, iii. 753.

Conder following Ewald suggests, might represent the site, perhaps better than other sites that have been suggested; but no importance attaches to the slight external resemblance between the names Reimun and Ramoth. The proposed identification of *Mispah of Gilead* with Sûf is accepted without question by Smith and Bartholomew, who fail to indicate Maṣfa, northwest of Gerasa and not far from Sûf, to which attention has been drawn by Schumacher. *Nahaliel* or the valley of God, which lay north of the Arnon, in the territory conquered from Sihon, king of the Amorites, would be "not an unfit name for the Wady Zerka Ma'in with its healing springs" (George Adam Smith).<sup>36</sup> With regard to *Makkedah*, a town in the lowland of Judah, its name and el-Mughâr of course do not correspond. The suggested identification rests mainly on the fact that the Arabic name means the cave, and there was a cave near Makkedah (Josh. x. 16). There were, however, many caves in the lowland. The location of Makkedah is but a conjecture. The site cannot be determined from the biblical data until the towns with which Makkedah is associated in Josh. xv. 40 and 41 have been positively identified. The identification of *Diblath* with Dibl, a village of upper Galilee, is a desperate guess, based wholly on a similarity of name. And where is the neighboring wilderness (Ezek. vi. 14)? Perhaps Diblath is the town of Beth-diblathaim, near the Arnon (Jer. xlvi. 22, 23), probably known also simply as Diblathaim (near Almon, Num. xxxviii. 46). Colonel Conder came later to share this view.<sup>37</sup>

II. Identifications which determine with more or less certainty the location of a place mentioned by Eusebius, Jerome, or Josephus, or in the Talmud, or in other early documents, but where the reasons which led the writer to identify the place with a biblical site are unknown and at times are even questioned.<sup>37</sup> Kefr Thilth is proposed as

<sup>36</sup> The Historical Geography of the Holy Land, p. 561 f.

<sup>37</sup> "The same doubt attaches to the frequent citation of passages from the Mishna and Talmud. Whether the men who set down in these

the modern representative of *Baal-shalishah*. The Septuagint and Lucian have Beth as the first syllable instead of Baal, and the Septuagint read Sarisa instead of Shalishah (Hebrew, Lucian). Eusebius and Jerome mention a village called Bethsarisa, fifteen Roman miles to the north of Diospolis, that is Lydda, and identify it with the place mentioned in 2 Kin. iv. 42, namely Baal-shalishah. The ruins Kefr Thilth are seventeen Roman miles northeast by north of Lydda, and Sirisia thirteen and a half Roman miles, as the crow flies. It is natural to connect Bethsarisa with Sirisia; but "Kefr Thilth preserves the name of Shalishah" (Conder),<sup>34</sup> corresponding exactly in radical letters. With regard to *Ebenezer*, on the ground of Eusebius' statement that Ebenezer was situated between Jerusalem and Ashkelon, near Beth-shemesh,<sup>35</sup> and the similarity of sound with Eben, the first constituent of the name Eben-ezer, Major Conder proposed to find the site at Deir Abân, two miles to the east of 'Ain Shems. The identification cannot be correct if the town of Shen (1 Sam. vii. 12) is Jeshanah; and consequently Colonel Conder later located Ebenezer "between Tell Našbeh and 'Ain Sînia (6 miles apart), near Bethel on a very high ridge".<sup>32</sup> Of the town of *Hannathon*, Major Conder says, "The site is uncertain, but the name is probably to be identified with the Talmudic Caphar Hana-niah, which according to the Mishnah . . . marked the limit of Upper Galilee. This is now Kefr 'Anân" (<sup>34</sup>; and see "The Expositor," Oct., 1885, p. 254). It is proposed to identify *Haphraim* with the ruin Farriyeh, six Roman miles northwest of Lejjun, rather than with el-Afuleh, seven Roman miles east-northeast of Lejjun. The former site agrees better in name, conforms exactly with the statement of Eusebius regarding distance from Legio, and is more

---

works their opinions about the geography of Palestine, followed a genuine tradition—which may certainly have existed—must in each several case be carefully investigated" (Socin in "The Expositor," October, 1885, p. 252).

<sup>35</sup> Onomasticon, edition of Lic. Dr. Erich Klostermann, p. 32, ll. 23-26.

nearly north of Legio;<sup>39</sup> but it is questionable whether the ruin lies within the bounds of Issachar. El-Afuleh is within the territory of Issachar, but the name does not correspond to Haphraim. The *hill of Phinchas*: in drawing attention to a tomb situated on the western side of Awertah, a quarter of a mile from the town and "bearing the name *el-'Azeir* (this would be Eleazar's)", Captain Conder has perhaps pointed out the cause which gave rise to the Samaritan tradition that the hill of Phinehas, son of Eleazar, is the ridge on which Awertah stands, scant five miles from Shechem.<sup>40</sup> The town of *Idalah* is identified by the Talmud with Hiriyyeh, which is possibly echoed in el-Huwarah, one mile south of Bethlehem of Zebulun.<sup>41</sup> *Ophrah of Manasseh* was the ancient name of Fer'ata, six miles west by south of Shechem, according to the Samaritan Chronicle.<sup>42</sup> 'Ain 'Atan is En Etam, the Rabbinical identification of the waters of Nephtoah.<sup>43</sup>

III. Identifications which depend upon a chain of evidence, links of which are weak. Here belong, first of all, several geographical names found in the book of Judith, namely Bethulia, Belamon, Betomestham, Cola, Choba, Chusi and the brook Mochmur. The name *Bethulia* may be echoed in Mithilia,<sup>44</sup> as Major Condor suggests; but Bethulia is one of the great puzzles. Its identification depends in part upon the determination of the sites of Betomestham and Belamon, and also upon the decision of the question regarding the original reading of Judith iv. 6, the

<sup>39</sup> Onomasticon, 28, 25.

<sup>40</sup> Survey of Western Palestine: Memoirs, ii. 218; see Name Lists, p. 124, "el-Azeir. Ezra is so called in Arabic".

<sup>41</sup> Neubauer, Géographie du Talmud, p. 189; Survey of Western Palestine: Memoirs, i. 288.

<sup>42</sup> Handbook to the Bible, p. 421.

<sup>43</sup> Handbook to the Bible, p. 258.

<sup>44</sup> The name is given as Meselieh on the Survey map, as Mithilieh by Major Conder in Hastings' "Dictionary of the Bible", as Meselieh or Mithilia in the "Memoirs", ii. 156 f., as Meselieh or Methelia in the "Name Lists", p. 188. Another place of the name is Khurbet Mithilia, three miles to the north of Athlit and about a mile back from the sea.

Greek text being in conflict with the Syriac and Vulgate.<sup>45</sup> It is uncertain whether *Belamon*, Belmen, Belmaim, Belbaim, Abelmain, as the name variously appears (Judith iv. 4, vii. 3, viii. 3), is the same place as Ibleam or Bileam. No confidence can be felt that the names *Betomestham* and *Cola* (Judith iv. 6, xv. 4) are still heard in Beit Massin and Kâ'aûn; and Colonel Conder himself latterly called Betomes-tham "an unknown site".<sup>32</sup> The names *Choba* and el-Mekhubby perhaps correspond etymologically; and the location appears to be not unsuitable, but it cannot be determined from the references in the book of Judith (iv. 4, xv. 4, 5). If Choba be Coabis, mentioned in the Peutinger Tables,<sup>46</sup> twelve Roman miles from Scythopolis and twelve from Archelais (Kurâwa), the situation of "the cave called 'Arâk el-Khubby and the ruin el-Mekhubby," close to the road from Shechem to Bethshean, is favorable to the identification. Regarding *Chusi* and the torrent-bed *Mochmur* (Judith vii. 18), the town Ekrebel, in the Syriac version Ekra-bath, mentioned in the book of Judith, may be Akrabatta of Josephus (War ii. 12, 4; iii. 3, 5) and, if so, the modern Akrabeh. In that case Chusi may be identified with Kûza, as Conder suggests, and the brook Mochmur with a valley in the neighborhood. But what wady represents it? Wady Ahmar, which descends eastwardly to the Jordan, mentioned long ago by Mr. George Grove<sup>47</sup> and later adopted by Major Conder, or Wady Yetma, which begins at Akrabeh and descends toward the Mediterranean Sea, passing three miles to the south of Kûza and taking a different name, as held by Father Barnabas Meistermann? The name Ahmar must not be allowed weight, since the remote, small, upper branch of the Wady Ahmar, at the point where Akrabeh stands, is known by a different name (Wady es-Seba, ravine of the lion, according to the Survey map);

<sup>45</sup> Meistermann, New Guide to the Holy Land, p. 356 f.

<sup>46</sup> Survey of Western Palestine: Memoirs, ii. 231.

<sup>47</sup> Article in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, edition of 1863.

and moreover the ancient name of the brook mentioned in the book of Judith seems to have been Mahmur.

Four towns mentioned in the Old Testament belong to this category of proposed identifications which depend upon a chain of evidence, of which some or all the links are weak. Thus, the value of the suggestion that *Kedesh* of Judg. iv. 11 is represented by the ruin Kadish, on the highland about three miles south of Tiberias, is connected with the question of the correctness of the identification proposed for Zaanaim. The names, indeed, correspond exactly, but are common in the ancient and modern geography of the country, and afford little aid in determining a site (see section iv. 3). Regarding *Zaanain* or *Zaanannim*, the absence of the article with the word oak in the Hebrew text, the presence of the letter beth on each occurrence of the name, and the reading of the Septuagint favor Bezaanim (that is, *Besa'anim*) as the original name (Josh. xix. 33, R. V. margin; Judg. iv. 11). The Talmudists seem to have heard a word which they used for a fen or marsh (*bis'a*) in *Besa'anim*; and they identified the place with the basin or swamps of Kedesh;<sup>48</sup> but it is not clear what locality they thus designated. Conder thinks that the name is still heard in the ruin Bessûm, a mile and a half north-northeast of Sarona and four miles due west of Khurbet Kadish, in "more exact form" surviving in the name 'Ayûn el-Busâs.<sup>49</sup> But on comparing the modern Arabic and the ancient Hebrew names, it is doubtful whether *Besa'anim* is etymologically akin to 'Ayûn el-Busâs and Bessûm, although the sibilants *sad* and *dad* do have affinity. If the *Nekeb*, i.e., "the pass", be regarded as a distinct name in the list (Josh. xix. 33) and not as distinguishing the village of Adam of the pass from Adam beside Zarethan, and if the Talmud be followed in identifying the *Nekeb* with Saidatha and Neubauer's suggestion be rejected that this is Bethsaida of the New

<sup>48</sup> Kohut, Aruch, i. 24; Neubauer, Géographie du Talmud, p. 225.

<sup>49</sup> Survey of Western Palestine: Memoirs, i. 365 bis; Name Lists, p. 124, 'Ayûn el-Busâs or el-Busâs; p. 128, Khurbet Bessûm.

Testament,<sup>50</sup> and if Bezaanannim and Jabneel be identified with Bessūm and Yemma (Josh. xix. 33 R.V. text and margin), then Seiyādeh may be Saidatha and mark the site of the Nekeb. Es-Simia is suggested for the site of *Eshean*. The correspondence between the two names depends upon altering the Hebrew text to Soma in accordance with the reading of the Vatican text of the Septuagint, although A and Lucian support the Hebrew form and the unusual reading of the Vatican text may be due to a copyist's misreading of the Hebrew letters or confusion of the name with the preceding word. For the site of *Mizpah of Benjamin* Sha'fāt is proposed. Mizpah became in Greek Maspah (2 Chron. xvi. 6; Neh. iii. 7, 15) and Massēpha or Masēphat or Massēphath (1 Sam. vii. 5 and 6, with the local ending). Near Jerusalem, with a view of the city and temple, was "a place called Sapha, which name translated into Greek means skopos", a lookout, a watchman; or in a textual variant skopē, a lookout-place or a watchtower (Antiq. xi. 8, 5; on the way from Gaza to Jerusalem? xi. 8, 4); and north of Jerusalem, about seven furlongs distant, between that city and Gibeah of Saul was a plain named Scopus, whence the city and temple could be seen (War v. 2, 1-3). Mizpah, which means watchtower, is conjecturally identified with these places. Now two miles and a quarter north of Jerusalem is the village Sha'fāt, and it is suggested that this name is a corruption of the ancient name, thus Mizpah, Maspah, Sapha, Sha'fāt.<sup>51</sup> It must be remembered, however, that the etymology of Mizpah is entirely different from that of Sha'fāt, there being only one radical letter common to the two names. Moreover, it is not claimed that Jerusalem is visible from Sha'fāt village, but from the plateau. Mizpah itself seems to have been near Gibeon, but not to the east of it like Sha'fāt (Jer. xli. 6, 12). Colonel Conder later abandoned the identification in favor

<sup>50</sup> Géographie du Talmud, p. 225.

<sup>51</sup> Survey of Western Palestine: Memoirs, iii. 14; Guérin, Judée, i. 395-402; cp. van de Velde, Memoir to Accompany the Map, 335.

of Tell en-Naṣbeh, three miles northeast of Gibeon.<sup>32</sup> As to *Pirathon*: on eliminating Fer'ata because the Samaritan Chronicle identifies it with Ophrah, Fer'on remains, containing the radical letters of Pirathon. It is rather far north to be in the territory of Ephraim; and Colonel Conder finally declared that "the site is unknown".<sup>32</sup> The identification of *Zebulun* in Asher (Josh. xix. 27) with Neby Sebelān assumes that Zebulun in this passage denotes a town and not the territory of the tribe Zebulun, and is based on the improbable identification proposed for Dabbesheth.

IV. Identifications of an ancient site with a ruin or a town bearing a similar name. Several varieties of varying degrees of probability may be considered under this head.

1. An identification is reasonably certain when name, location, and nature of the locality are suitable. For example, the rock *Seneh* with the southern cliff of the Wady Suweinit, which retains the old name, at a point to the east of Geba. This identity was mentioned by Dr. Edward Robinson,<sup>52</sup> and accordingly, not having been suggested first by the Survey, it is properly without an asterisk in Mr. Armstrong's list. With confidence also, although few data are available, the identification proposed for *Shamir* can be accepted; for the name Shamir can be combined with Sômerah, and the latter place is situated among the towns with which Shamir is associated in the book of Joshua (xv. 48-50). The proposed identification of *Zereth-shahar*, a town of Reuben, in the mount of the valley (Josh. xiii. 19) with the ruins es-Sara, on a hill on the south side of Wady Zerka Ma'in, deserves favorable consideration. The hot springs and the mountain bear the name es-Sara. The location, the brief description of the locality, and quite likely the etymology suit.

2. Though the name still remains, the data including the name may determine the immediate vicinity only. Thus, the name of *Debir*, on the northern boundary of Judah

<sup>32</sup> Later Biblical Researches, p. 289.

(Josh. xv. 7), is probably preserved in Thogret ed-Debr; but the specific identification with this cleft is proposed by Major Conder with caution, who calls it "probable"; and it must be received with caution, since the name is echoed in several localities in this neighborhood. *Etam*, a place of abundant waters, two reeds (*schoinoi*) from Jerusalem (Antiq. viii. 7, 3), near Bethlehem, Tekoa, and Peor (Josh. xv. 59, Septuagint; 2 Chron. xi. 6), was evidently at or near the spring 'Ain 'Atân, a name sufficiently like Etam to be its echo. A village or ruin in the neighborhood, therefore, marks the site. The village of Urtas was suggested long ago.<sup>53</sup>

3. Though the name is the same, it may not be significant for purposes of identification, being some common object of nature from which places often receive name; and the data regarding the location may be quite general. Thus, in default of particulars as to location, no reliance can be placed upon the existence to-day of a town called el-Mughâr or el-Mogheiriyeh, cave, or Jebî'a, hill, or Ramah, height, or Tibnah, straw.<sup>54</sup> And such is the case with the identification proposed for *Mearah*; also that for the two towns, or perhaps one town, of *Beth-shemesh* in the north;<sup>55</sup> and that for *Etam*, a name which means place of beasts of prey, a village of the Simeonites (1 Chron. iv. 32) with 'Aitun, nine miles north by east of the ruin Umm er-Rumânin; and that for *Ether*, thornbush, in the lowland of Judah, but given to the Simeonites (Josh. xv. 42; cp. 1 Chron. iv. 32), with the ruined village of 'Atr,<sup>56</sup> about a mile northwest by north of Beit Jibrin; and that for *Gibeah of Benjamin*, meaning thereby *Gibeath* mentioned in Josh. xviii. 28, with Jeb'a, two miles southwest of Kuriet el-'Enab;<sup>52</sup> and that for *Luz*,

<sup>53</sup> Robinson, Biblical Researches, edition of 1841, ii. 168.

<sup>54</sup> So in "Baedeker" Socin says: "'Ain Karim probably answers to the Karem of the Septuagint (Josh. xv. 60), although the name, which signifies vineyard, is too common to be much relied upon as a clue."

<sup>55</sup> The site of *Beth-shemesh*, Josh. xix. 22, is "doubtful", and that of *Beth-shemesh*, Josh. xix. 38, is "unknown" (Conder).<sup>54</sup>

<sup>56</sup> See already van de Velde, Memoir, p. 311.

almond tree, in the land of the Hittites (Judg. i. 26), with el-Luveziyeh, four and a half miles west by north of Banias, and *Ramah*, on the boundary line of Asher, with Râmia, thirteen miles south by east of Tyre. The situation of these towns is not defined within narrow limits, and the names themselves are too common in the geography of the region to serve alone for the substantial foundation of an identification. The identification of Ramah with Râmia was proposed by Dr. Edward Robinson,<sup>57</sup> and is not starred by Mr. Armstrong; and then, too, Ramah on the boundary of Asher may be the fortified town of Naphtali, and represented to-day by er-Râmeh, about six miles southwest of Safed and seventeen miles east of Acre. The identification of *Beth-gamul* with el-Jemail, seven miles to the east of Dibon, is favored by its association with Dibon, Nebo, Beth-diblathaim, Kiriathaim, and Beth-meon in Jer. xlvi. 22 f. The similarity of name is illusory, however; for the geography of modern Palestine is studded with local names derived from the same root as Gamul.<sup>58</sup>

4. The name may be the same, without being notably frequent in the geography of the country, yet the data regarding the location may be quite general. Thus, *Chozeba* corresponds etymologically with Kûeizîba, and the ruins known by the latter name are in the territory of Judah, as they should be; but the location, five and a half miles north of Hebron, is not altogether beyond question, since it is on the eastern slope of the mountains and not in the lowland west of the mountain, as are the towns mentioned with

<sup>57</sup> Later Biblical Researches, p. 63 f.

<sup>58</sup> Seventy-five miles to the northeast is, of course, Umm el-Jemâl, in which many have seen the site of Beth-gamul. Near el-Jemâl are 'Ain el-Jemmâleh and Wady Jemmâleh (Survey of Eastern Palestine, pp. 9, 253). Or, to take a more familiar part of the country, the Survey map shows el-Jemel two miles and a half due east of Jerusalem, the ruin Umm el-Jemel three miles toward the southeast of the city, and 'Ain el-Jemil five miles toward the northwest. Two miles south of Beth-shemesh is Beit el-Jemâl, and about a mile and a half south of Gezer is Bir el-Jemâl. Similar names are found in other parts of the country.

Chozeba in 1 Chron. iv. 17-23 so far as they have been identified. Moreover, Chozeba is generally believed to be the same as Chezib and Achzib. Regarding the town of *Ijon*, "the name is thought to survive in Merj 'Ayûn" (Conder),<sup>31</sup> a fertile district at the foot of Mount Hermon, on the west; and the indications of locality point to a town in this immediate neighborhood (1 Kin. xv. 20; 2 Kin. xv. 29). Two sites have been proposed. Conder suggests el-Khiâm on the eastern edge of Merj 'Ayûn, but says that "the most important site on this plateau is Tell Dibbin on the northern edge, and this tell "may be the site of Ijon", as "Robinson . . . suggested", and as is generally preferred. As to the town of *Hazar-susah*, the site is unknown, but "may have been at Sûsin, 10 miles south of Gaza" (Conder).<sup>32</sup> This identification had previously been suggested by Canon Tristram, and is not starred by Mr. Armstrong as due to the Survey.

5. Again, though the name is the same, the location of the suggested site may beget distrust; as in the case of *Gibeah* and *Timnah*, towns of Judah. The names are not significant, and the situation of Jeba' and Tibna, ten and twelve miles north of Hebron and almost due west of Bethlehem, is suspicious in view of the other towns of the group (Josh. xv. 55-57). Rather a site southeast of Hebron is indicated. The fact, however, that Jeba' and Tibna are situated side by side, and Gibeah and Timnah are named together, must be allowed weight (Conder, article *Timnah*<sup>32</sup>). The proposed identification of *Thimnathah*, correctly Timnah, of Dan (Josh. xix. 43, R. V.) with the ruin Tibne, twelve miles northeast of Lydda, is groundless. It is rejected by investigators generally, including C. W. Wilson.<sup>34</sup> This town of Dan is rather the town of the name on the boundary of Judah-Dan, west of Beth-shemesh; an opinion to which Colonel Conder finally gave assent.<sup>32</sup> The name *Giloh* is not quite identical in etymology with that of the ruin Jâla, and the location of the ruin, six and a half miles north by west of Hebron is aloof from the

towns associated with Giloh in Josh. xv. 48-51, so far as they have been identified. *Haruph*, whether the name of a town or a family, belonged to Benjamin (1 Chron. xii. 5; cp. Neh. vii. 24-32), not to the lowland of Judah (where the village of Kharûf is situated, five miles east of Eleutheropolis). *Hezron* (Josh. xv. 3); the location proposed is unsuitable, being east of 'Ain Kadis, and the identification is based on Lieutenant Conder's private assumption that Kadesh-barnea is not to be sought at 'Ain Kadis, but lay some forty miles to the east of that spring.<sup>59</sup> *Jarmuth*, known also as *Ramoth* and *Remeth*, was a town of Issachar (Josh. xix. 21; xxi. 29; 1 Chron. vi. 73), and hence scarcely identical with er-Rameh, five miles and a half southwest of Dothan. *Megiddo* is not Mujedda, three miles southwest of Bethshean. The city of *Salt* was presumably near En-gedi (Josh. xv. 62), hence not Tell el-Milh. The situation of Surdah renders the proposed identification of it with *Zeredah* utterly improbable. Surdah is situated in the hill country of Ephraim, indeed; but it is two miles and a half northwest of Bethel, twenty miles from the Jordan and not within sight of the river; whereas Zeredah was apparently within the bounds of Ephraim, west of the Jordan, and either opposite Succoth or else serving with Succoth to mark the northern and southern limits of a section of the plain of the Jordan (1 Kin. xi. 26; 2 Chron. iv. 17, cp. Zarethan in 1 Kin. vii. 46). *Zoar*: the name Shaghûr may be etymologically related, through a later form of the name; but the location conflicts with the statements of Josephus and Eusebius, if not also with those of Isaiah and Jeremiah.

6. In this connection may be mentioned those suggested identifications where a correspondence more or less close exists between an ancient and a modern name and an echo of the former may supposedly be heard in the latter, but the name is an insufficient basis and indications of the situation of the ancient place are too scanty in Hebrew and other early literature to render a positive identification pos-

<sup>59</sup> Handbook to the Bible, pp. 250, 257.

sible. Thus it is in the case of *Gibbethon*, *Irpeel* in Benjamin, *Lahmam* or *Lahmas* in the lowland of Judah, *Las-sharon*, *Rabbah* of Judah, the rock *Etam*, and the land of *Tob*. The site of *Achzib* of Judah, known also in correct variant form as *Chezib*, is placed at 'Ain el-Kezbeh. Kezbeh denotes a tree of hard wood (Name Lists, p. 280), and being a familiar word might supplant the use of Chezib and Achzib in the mouth of a people speaking Arabic; but it does not contain the middle radical of the root which regularly corresponds to that of Achzib. Favorable is the location near Mareshah, Keilah, and Adullam (Josh. xv. 44; Mic. i. 14; Gen. xxxviii. 1, 2, 5), in the bounds of Eleutheropolis (Onomasticon, p. 172, 6). Much depends on the proper identification of Adullam, and that site is uncertain. *Alema* (1 Mac. v. 26) is identified by Schumacher, acting for the Palestine Exploration Fund, with Kefr el-Mâ, ten miles east of the sea of Galilee. Buhl (p. 253), like Merrill, prefers Alma or Iima, about twenty-five miles farther east, five miles to the northwest of Kerak. *Beth-haccherem* is mentioned twice (Neh. iii. 14; Jer. vi. 1). Its identification with 'Ain Karim<sup>60</sup> is opposed by the statement of Jerome, in commenting on Jeremiah, that it was a village on a mountain between Jerusalem and Tekoa, and visible from Bethlehem. According to Mr. Armstrong it is "not identified", and Colonel Conder finally said, "The site is unknown".<sup>32</sup> Regarding *Bezek*, the location of Bezekah, three miles northeast of Gezer, is suitable, being in the territory allotted to Judah (Judg. i. 4); but the allusion to the situation is not definite, and the place is conceivably the same as that mentioned in 1 Sam. xi. 8. For the site of *Jeshua* the ruin Sa'weh, twelve miles east of Beer-sheba, is suggested. Jeshua is mentioned with towns in the extreme south of Judah (Neh. xi. 26), and may be the same as Shema, which is associated with the same towns (Josh. xv. 26; and xix. 2 Septuagint), and the ruin Sa'weh lies in the midst of this group. *Lachish* has some similarity in sound

<sup>60</sup> See footnote number 54.

with Tell el-Hesy, but the other requirements are sufficiently met to command confidence. As to *Madon* in northern Canaan, the text is uncertain, and the name should perhaps be Maron (Josh. xi. 1, Septuagint B; and xii. 19 Lucian). On the Survey map it is marked with a query at Madin, five miles west by north of Tiberias; but Major Conder himself says that the site is doubtful.<sup>31</sup>

V. Suggested identification where the names do not correspond and 1. The available data in the Old Testament and other early literature indicate the general location only. Identifications of this sort are groundless, but of course by a lucky chance may happen to be correct. Such are the sites conjectured for *Achshaph*, *Almon-diblathaim*, *Beth-dagon* in Asher, *Edrei* in Naphtali, *Eleph*, *Enam*, *En-haddah*, *Hadashah*, *Hosah*,<sup>61</sup> *Jaser*, *Madmen*, *Maked*, *Manahath*, *Mishal*, *Nahalat*, *Sharuhem*, *Tirzah*.<sup>61</sup> For Enam and Jazer Colonel Conder abandoned his former identifications, and latterly suggested for Enam "Kefr 'Ana, six miles northwest of Tibneh, . . . where the valley of Sorek enters the Philistine plain", and for Jazer the ruin Sâ'aûr, on a high hill four miles north of Heshbon.<sup>32</sup> The location of *Ai*, *En-tappuah*, the hill *Hachilah*, and *Maarath* is known within comparatively narrow limits, but the present names of the sites suggested for these places by members of the Survey do not correspond in etymology with the ancient names of these places. Of the identification proposed for *Abesz*, Professor W. R. Smith says that the name el-Beidah "‘the white village’ can have nothing to do with the old name" Abesz.<sup>62</sup> Nothing favors the identification of *Amad* with Khurbet el-‘Amud, two miles east by south of Achzib of Asher. ‘Am‘ad is not the same word as ‘Amûd, although probably from the same root. Moreover ‘amud is not a name significant for the purposes of identification. It is, of course, a common noun, meaning column; and local names containing this word are met with in all parts of

<sup>61</sup> See *Expositor*, October 1885, p. 254.

<sup>62</sup> *Encyclopaedia Biblica*.

Palestine, wherever there is a ruin with a column or two sticking out of the ground.<sup>63</sup> Of *Ashnah*, mentioned with Eshtaol, Zorah, and Zanoah, in the lowland of Judah, as the site of which Kefr Hasan (Armstrong) or Khurbet Hasan two miles northwest of Zorah, is proposed, Major Conder himself later said: "The site is unknown."<sup>34</sup> The situation of Bel'âin near Gezer is suitable to be the site of *Baalath* (Josh. xix. 44; Antiq. viii. 6, 1), but the name does not correspond. The group of towns, in which *Gallim* of Josh. xv. 59 Septuagint appears, suggests indeed a site for this Gallim at or near Beit Jâla, three miles northwest of Bethlehem, but etymology does not commend the identification. Mr. Armstrong rejects it. As the site of *Hali* the ruin 'Alia is proposed. The names, however, are not identical, and the word 'Alia is frequent in geographical names (see van de Velde<sup>10</sup>). *Helkath-hazzurim*, the place of combat between twelve of Abner's young men and twelve of Joab's was at the pool of Gibeon, but the exact spot cannot be pointed out. There is nothing in Mr. C. F. T. Drake's suggestion of a connection with the name Wady el-'Askar, soldiers' valley, just north of Gibeon; for 'askar is a word of frequent occurrence in the geography of Palestine, and is without historical significance as the reminiscence of an ancient fight. The forest of *Hereth*, in A. V. Hareth, was apparently in the land of Judah, and the identification of Hereth with Kharâs is proposed; but the formation of the two names is different, and it is doubtful whether even the roots correspond. The suggestion that *Ir-nahash* is represented by Deir Nakhkhas is already found in van de Velde's

<sup>63</sup> Several such names are found in the ancient territory of Asher: within six miles to the east and the south of Tyre are the hill el-'Amud, the ruin el-'Amud, and the ruin el-'Awâmid; about the same distance north by east of Achzib is the rather famous field of ruins known as Khurbet Umm el-'Amud. If in Wady el-Melek, immediately north of Mount Carmel is really echoed the name Allammelech (Josh. xix. 26), and if a certain similarity of sound is allowed weight, then the situation of Umm el-'Amed a mile west of Bethlehem of Zebulun and a mile and a half south of the Wady el-Melek, is suitable as the site of 'Am'ad.<sup>10</sup>

"Memoir" (p. 322). But the first two letters of Deir Nakhkhas may not be ignored and Ir-nahash seen in the remainder. Nor may it be said off hand that Deir has taken the place of Ir.<sup>32</sup> So far as the names are concerned the "monastery of the cattle-drover" has nothing to do with the "city of Nahash" or "snaketown". As to the identification of *Mar'alah* with Ma'lūl "not only the change of r to l, but also the intrusion of 'ain before lamed, must be accounted for" (Ewing).<sup>34</sup> *Mosah* is not the same etymologically as Mizzeh (in Beit Mizzeh), notwithstanding Conder's remark that "the Hebrew tsade becomes the Arabic zain in some cases".<sup>34</sup> The two names, moreover, are different in meaning. *Naarath* was on the southern boundary line of Ephraim, between Janoah and the Jordan (Josh. xvi. 7), according to the "Onomasticon" five Roman miles from Jericho. These indications point to a site on the Nahr el-'Aujah; perhaps, as Guérin suggested, at 'Ain es-Sâmîeh<sup>65</sup> or, as Conder thinks, about ten miles lower down, at the ruin el-'Aujah et-Tahtâni, short of six Roman miles from old Jericho. Regarding the town of *Nebo*, which is mentioned in Ezra ii. 29 immediately after Bethel and Ai, the data do not indicate its location, and neither Beit Nûba, thirteen miles westsouthwest of Bethel, nor Nûba, seven miles northwest by north of Hebron, is etymologically the same as Nebo. For the site of *Neiel*, somewhere on the eastern frontier of Asher, Ya'nîn is suggested;<sup>66</sup> but even with due allowance made for the final letter, the two names are utterly unrelated. Conder distinguishes *Ramath-mizpeh* from Mizpeh of Gilead (although granting the possibility of its being the same place<sup>32</sup>), and identifies it with Remtheh. The two names are entirely different in etymology; and the situation of Ramath-mizpeh is not clearly indicated in the Bible, and this is true whether Ramath-mizpeh is a different

<sup>64</sup> The Temple Dictionary of the Bible.

<sup>65</sup> Samarie, i. 211-213.

<sup>66</sup> "The similarity of name suggests its identification with Ya'nîn in the required direction" (Survey of Western Palestine: Memoirs, i. 286).

place from Ramoth-gilead, as Conder believes, or is the same place. *Shion* in Issachar, and according to the "Onomasticon" (p. 158, 13) near Tabor, is identified with 'Ayûn esh-Sha'in, as was proposed by Eli Smith; but the names are not the same in etymology, and the situation seems strange for a town of Issachar. *Tiphsah*, mentioned in 2 Kin. xv. 16, does not correspond in etymology to Tafsah, a ruin six miles southwest by west of Shechem; for the Arabic word ṭafsah, begins with the emphatic t-sound ṭā and means filth, and its first letter is a radical, not a formative, and represents the Hebrew teth, not the tau of Tiphsah. Strangely enough later Colonel Conder, contrary to the Arabic form of the name as given in the "Name Lists" (p. 186), says: "Tafsâl . . . preserves the final gutteral" heth.<sup>32</sup> The name of mount *Zalmon* is not related etymologically to "Jebel Eslamiyah (Ebal)". The identification is rejected by Mr. Armstrong, and is not alluded to by Colonel Conder in his latest work.

2. Identifications proposed, although the soundness of the Hebrew text is questionable and an error in the transmission of the ancient name is possible and at times quite probable, as in the case of the identifications proposed for *Anem*, *Aner*, and *Sechu*, as though these names were in their original form. *Dimon* is probably an intentional variant of Dibon, and not a textual corruption. The identification suggested for *Sarid* may be favorably mentioned here. Sarid was on the southern frontier of Zebulun, west of Chisloth-tabor (Josh. xix. 10, 12); and if the name is a corrupt form of an original Sadid, the site may well be represented by Tell Shadûd, five miles southwest of Nazareth. In 2 Sam. xxiv. 6 for *Hodshi* read Kadesh; a plausible emendation of the text, proposed by Thenius and subsequently confirmed by Lucian's recension.

3. Identifications proposed, although the names do not correspond and the location of the suggested site awakens distrust. Thus *Aphek*, mentioned in 1 Sam. xxix. 1, does not correspond etymologically with Fuku'a; and the situ-

ation of Fuku'a on the mountain, six miles southeast of Jezreel, renders the proposed identification still more improbable. Colonel Conder later ignored this identification, and said that the site of Aphek was perhaps north of Jezreel.<sup>32</sup> Regarding the valley of *Charashim*, that is, of craftsmen, Conder's real thought is only that the ruin Hirsha "may perhaps retain a trace of the title",<sup>67</sup> but it is questionable whether the names correspond etymologically, whether the sibilants are related. Moreover, the ruin Hirsha is ten miles from the nearest towns mentioned in Neh. xi. 34 and 35, and is remote from the circumference of the district which these towns encircle. As to *Dannah*, the situation of the towns associated with it in Josh. xv. 49 suggests a site much farther south than Idhna. The latter part of *Elon-beth-hanan*, namely Beth-hanan, may be represented by Beit 'Anân, eight and a half miles northwest of Jerusalem; but the names are not identical, and Beth-hanan, to judge from the towns associated with it, was in the lowland of Dan, whereas Beit 'Anân would naturally belong to Benjamin and be subject to the official for Benjamin (1 Kin. iv. 9, 18). Regarding *Holon*, the name does not correspond with that of Beit 'Alâm, and Major Conder dropped this identification in favor of a neighboring site, a mile to the northeast, known as Beit Aûla.<sup>34</sup> But etymological agreement does not exist even yet, and a site six miles and a half northwest of Hebron seems too remote from the other towns of the group. Later Colonel Conder again suggested Beit 'Alâm.<sup>32</sup> The names *Janum* and *Beni Na'îm* are entirely different in etymology; and the situation is rather unfavorable, to judge from the location of the towns with which it is associated and the order in which they are listed in the one passage where Janum is named. The name of *Jethlah* and that of *Beit Tûl* are not etymologically akin, and the suggested site is a surprising location for a town of Dan. As to *Kirjath-jearim*, neither the etymology nor, so far as appears, the location is met by

<sup>67</sup> Survey of Western Palestine: Memoirs, iii. 36.

the ruin 'Erma,<sup>68</sup> eleven miles west by south of Jerusalem, and two miles and a quarter south by west of Kesla. Contrary to Conder's opinion, Josh. xv. 10 is surely against the location proposed by him. 'Erma is also remote from the Gibeonite settlements (Josh. ix. 17). The proposed identification of *Madmannah* with Umm Deimneh, twelve miles northeast of Beer-sheba, was rejected later by Major Conder himself as unsuitable,<sup>34</sup> only to be revived by him later.<sup>32</sup> The emphatic consonant k of el-Mekenna is not the Hebrew kaph, which appears in *Meconah*, and the place of Meconah in the succession of towns mentioned in Neh. xi. 28 suggests a place between Beer-sheba and En-rimmon, not a place twelve miles northnorthwest of Beit Jibrin. Moreover, it does not correspond either in distance or direction from Eleutheropolis with the village Machamim mentioned in the "Onomasticon" (with Beth-maacah, p. 57), with which Conder would connect it. The site of *Meronoth* is probably to be sought, not at Marrina, seven miles north of Hebron, but in Benjamin, in the neighborhood of Gibeon and Mizpah (Neh. iii. 7). His identification of *Minnith* with Minyeh is rejected by Major Conder himself and by Mr. Armstrong, the former saying: "Minyeh . . . south of Nebo . . . may be derived from another root, and in any case is much too far south"<sup>34</sup> Yet Colonel Conder suggests it again.<sup>32</sup> The correspondence of the name *Seccakah*, a village in the wilderness of Judah (Josh. xv. 61), with ed-Dikkeh is doubtful, and the situation of the ruins two miles east of Bethany renders the identification suspicious, and Colonel Conder finally said, "The site is not known".<sup>32</sup> More suitable as a reminiscence of the name and in location is Wady ed-Dekakin, which begins about three miles to the southeast of Bethany, runs eastwardly and northeastwardly toward the Jordan, and belongs entirely to the wilderness. *Shaaraim* was a town in the lowland of Judah (Josh. xv.

<sup>68</sup> This word means a dam or dyke and suggests that the ruin has taken its name merely from a dam that was thrown across the wady at this point.

36), apparently west of Socoh and Azekah (1 Sam. xvii. 52 with 1). The ruin Sa'ireh is in the hill country rather than in the lowland, but it may have been reckoned to the lowland. Moreover, if Shaaraim means the two gates, as is generally and plausibly believed, the two names do not correspond in radicals. For the site of *Zior* Major Conder, as previously van de Velde,<sup>10</sup> has suggested Si'aîr. This word may be the common noun meaning flame. At any rate it is not radically the same as *Zior*. Moreover, the mention of *Zior* would be expected in Josh. xv. 58 and 59, not in verse 54, if its site was four miles and a half north-northeast of Hebron.

The majority of the proposed identifications, it must be remembered, are offered by Major Conder and his associates on the Survey as possible or probable only.<sup>13</sup> While many of them may be correct, as a whole they do not sufficiently meet the conditions of substantial identification which were in the mind of Lieutenant Conder himself from the very beginning of his work<sup>9</sup> and which must concur in order to be valid evidence. And with notable exceptions, such as Eltekeh and Ramoth-gilead and the boundary towns, even a successful and final identification of the sites for which suggestions are made in this list of one hundred and sixty-eight, while interesting would yet be a matter of comparative unimportance, since many of the towns are mentioned but once or twice in the Scriptures, played no part in Israel's history, and if identified could seldom be used as a factor in solving larger geographical problems. The great contribution which Major Conder has made to the study of the geography of the Holy Land consists, therefore, not in these suggestions, which are but a by-product of his work, but in the survey of Western Palestine and the accompanying descriptive "Memoirs."

*Princeton.*

JOHN D. DAVIS.

## THE SILENCE OF ECCLESIASTICUS CONCERNING DANIEL

If we can believe the newspaper reports of the answers of Madame Caillaux, wife of the late Finance Minister of the French Republic, to the interrogatories of the magistrate conducting the preliminary examinations into the reasons why she assassinated M. Calmette, the editor of Figaro, it was a difficult matter for her to determine why she fired the fatal shot. It is, in fact, a difficult matter for any of us to analyze the various motives which have conducted to any given course of action, or that have converged toward the production of a certain line of thought. Much more difficult is it to unfold the manifold complexities involved in our critical conclusions and in our literary judgments.

Yet, in spite of this recognized difficulty in discovering our own motives, how many there are who think that they can perform the much more difficult task of discovering the motives of a man who lived two thousand, or more, years ago. This is especially true, when we come to consider the reasons why an author is silent with respect to some person, or event, of his own or preceding times. This silence may have resulted from ignorance; but it may just as well have resulted from prejudice, misjudgment, neglect, or contempt. In no case, however, would the silence prove that the person never existed, or that the event did not occur.

For example, it is found that Jesus ben Sira makes no mention of Daniel, nor any reference to the book bearing his name. The motive, or reason, for this silence is utterly unknown to us. Nevertheless, this silence has been assumed to be a proof that at the time of Ben Sira the book of Daniel had not been written, and even, that at that time the Jews were in ignorance of the fact that such a man as Daniel had ever existed. This assumption is made, notwithstanding that there is good reason for supposing that

Ben Sira intentionally omitted all reference to Daniel, or his book. For the works of Ben Sira show that he was a man of pronounced prejudices and opinions. His views might be characterized as Sadducean and nationalistic. When he gives an account of the great men of his nation, he selects for his encomiums those who had most distinguished themselves according to his ideas of what constituted greatness. We, doubtless, would have added some names that he has omitted from his list. We might have omitted some that he has selected. We certainly would have given more space to the praise of some than he has given, and less to the praise of others. But after all has been said, we will have to admit that there must be granted to him the right and the liberty to praise as he pleases the men whom he wishes to praise. That he has passed by some whom we most highly esteem does not show that he was not aware of their existence. It simply shows that he had reasons of his own, that seemed satisfactory to him, for rejecting them from his list of worthies.

This brief exordium is by way of introduction to the objections made to the early date of the book of Daniel on the ground that it cannot have existed before Ecclesiasticus was written, because neither Daniel nor his book is mentioned, nor apparently even referred to, by Ben Sira. The objections are stated as follows.

### OBJECTIONS

"Jesus son of Sirach (writing c. 200 B.C.), in his enumeration of Israelitish worthies, c. 44-50, though he mentions Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and (collectively) the Twelve Minor Prophets, is silent as to Daniel".<sup>1</sup>

"The silence of Jesus Sirach (Ecclesiasticus) concerning Daniel seems to show that the prophet was unknown to that late writer who, in his list of celebrated men (C. XLIX), makes no mention of Daniel, but passes from Jeremiah to Ezekiel and then to the twelve Minor Prophets and

---

<sup>1</sup> Driver: *Literature of the Old Testament*, p. 498.

Zerubbabel. If Daniel had been known to Jesus Sirach, we would certainly expect to find his name in this list, probably between Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Again, the only explanation seems to be that the Book of Daniel was not known to Sirach who lived and wrote between 200 and 180 B.C. Had so celebrated a person as Daniel been known, he could hardly have escaped mention in such a complete list of Israel's leading spirits. Hengstenberg remarked that Ezra and Mordecai were also left unmentioned, but the case is not parallel. Daniel is represented in the work attributed to him as a great prophet, while Ezra appears in the Book bearing his name as nothing more than a rather prominent priest and scholar".<sup>2</sup>

That Ben Sira knew nothing about Daniel is said to be supported by his statement in chapter xlix. 17, that "no man was born upon earth like unto Joseph, whereas the narratives respecting Daniel represent him much like unto Joseph in regard to both the high distinctions he attained and the faculties he displayed; and further, the very wording of the narratives in the first part of Daniel is modelled after that of the narratives in Genesis concerning Joseph".<sup>3</sup>

### ASSUMPTIONS

The assumptions involved in the above objections are as follows:

1. That Ezra and Mordecai did not deserve mention by Ben Sira as well as Daniel did.
2. That the mention of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Twelve, by Ben Sira, while he is silent as to Daniel, proves that Daniel was unknown to him.
3. That the passing from his mention of the Twelve directly to Zerubbabel, implies that Daniel was not known to Ben Sira.
4. That the silence of Ecclesiasticus concerning Daniel, shows that the prophet and his book were unknown to Ben Sira.

<sup>2</sup> Prince; *Commentary on Daniel*, p. 16f.

<sup>3</sup> Driver: *Daniel*, pages 17 and 64.

5. That the statement of Ben Sira, that there was no man like Joseph, shows an ignorance on his part of the existence of the man Daniel.

#### DISCUSSION OF THE ASSUMPTIONS

I. The assumption that the omission of the names of Ezra and Mordecai from the list of Ben Sira's worthies is easily to be accounted for on the ground of their relative inferiority to Daniel is a matter of opinion merely. Prince thinks that "Daniel is represented in the work attributed to him as a great prophet, while Ezra appears in the Book bearing his name as nothing more than a rather prominent priest and scholar". As to the part of this statement which refers to Daniel, I would be the last man to deny it; although as I have shown elsewhere, I believe that Daniel's greatness as a prophet was not recognized until after so many of his predictions had been so accurately fulfilled in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. But even if he had been recognized as a great prophet, we must remember that he had said and done nothing to exalt or save the law, the temple, the city of Jerusalem, or the land or people of Israel. Ezra, however, was the greatest protagonist of the Law since the days of Moses and Joshua. The whole critical hypothesis of the formation of the Canon and of the fixation of the vast fabric of the Jewish ceremonies of the Second Temple, is based on the theory that Ezra collected and edited and induced the people to accept formally the so-called first part of the three-fold Canon of the Old Testament Scriptures. In his own time he was the determiner and the champion of orthodoxy, and in all succeeding ages he has been recognized as the organizer of the Temple service and the first of the ready scribes in the Law of Moses.

Now, as to Ezra, Dr. Driver says, that "the second section of the book, c. 7-10, dealing with Ezra's own age, there is no reason to doubt, is throughout either written by Ezra or based upon materials left by him" (LOT, 549); and Kosters and Cheyne in the Ency. Bibl., 1473 say, that of

his "memoirs, written by himself, some portions unaltered and others considerably modified, have come down to us in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah". If the failure of Ben Sira to mention Ezra is no evidence against the existence, the works, and the writings of Ezra, or against Ben Sira's knowledge of the same; so, in like manner, his failure to mention Daniel is no evidence against the existence, the work and the writings of Daniel, or against Ben Sira's knowledge of them.

As to Mordecai's being in the same class of great men as Daniel, I am inclined to agree with Professor Prince that he was not. But unfortunately for Professor Prince's argument, neither his opinion nor mine is the determining factor in this discussion, but that of the Jews of the time of Ben Sira; and as to this I am not so certain as Professor Prince seems to be that in their estimation Mordecai may not have been "parallel" to Daniel but even have outranked him in importance. For to them Daniel was a minister of foreign kings and the interpreter of their dreams, the great seer of the fortunes of world empires, and the least nationalistic,—perhaps we might even say the least patriotic—of all the prophets; whereas Mordecai was the upholder of the narrowest form of racial exclusiveness, the deliverer of his people from extermination, and the founder of the great national festival of Purim, the only festival which in the belief of the Jews had been decreed between the time of Moses and that of Ben Sira. By all critics, therefore, who like Dr. Driver put the book of Esther as early as the 3rd century B.C. (LOT, 484), this omission of the name of Mordecai from a list of Israel's heroes must be acknowledged as parallel to that of Daniel. So that it seems impossible to escape the conclusion that Ben Sira's failure to mention Daniel, Ezra, and Mordecai, is no argument against the existence of the works and writings of the persons bearing their names, nor of Ben Sira's knowledge of the same.

II. As to the assumption that because Ben Sira mentions

Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the Twelve, without mentioning Daniel, he did not know of Daniel, several remarks may be made.

1. Ben Sira does not propose to mention all the prophets of the Old Testament. As a matter of fact, he names only Moses, Samuel, Nathan, Elijah, Elisha, Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel. All of these were prominent in the political and religious history of the land and people; whereas, Daniel left his land while a boy, and spent his life among the kings and wise men of Babylon.

2. Ben Sira does not propose to mention the books of the Old Testament; nor does he mention a single one of them, nor cite specifically by name from any one of them.

3. In Ben Sira's time, Daniel may have been counted as one of the Twelve, just as Ruth was, then and as late as the time of Josephus and later, counted as part of Judges; and just as Lamentations was often counted as part of Jeremiah. In the time of Ben Sira, Jonah may have been a part of the book of Kings; for as Dr. Driver says: "Both in form and contents, the Book of Jonah resembles the biographical narrative of Elijah and Elisha" (LOT 322). It must be remembered that Ben Sira does not name anyone of the Twelve Minor Prophets and that all that he says of them is: "Let their bones be flourishing" (c. XLIX. 10 b) and, if XLIX. 10 c. d. refer to them and not Daniel, that "they comforted Jacob and saved him with the hope of truth".

III. The next assumption is that the Book of Daniel was not known to Ben Sira because he passes from Jeremiah to Ezekiel and then to the Twelve Minor Prophets and Zerubbabel without mentioning Daniel. This assumption is based on two false assumptions. First, that Ben Sira is naming the books of the Old Testament; and secondly, that he is naming all of his heroes in a chronological order. In the former case, one might ask where he finds the books of Phinehas and Zerubbabel. In the latter case, attention need only be called to the facts, that the account of Josiah is in-

serted between the mention of Isaiah and that of Jeremiah, and the description of Job between that of Ezekiel and that of the Twelve and that of Joseph between that of Nehemiah and that of Simon.

Again, it is remarkable that just as Nathan is connected with David so Isaiah and Jeremiah are mentioned in connection with Hezekiah and Josiah. Each of the three kings of Israel had a good prophet to support him. Each of the three good prophets had a worthy Israelitish king to support.<sup>4</sup> But of what good king of Israel was Daniel the prophet? Of Nebuchadnezzar, forsooth?

Furthermore, Professor Prince fails to notice two other points which are at least as surprising as Ben Sira's omission to mention Daniel and Ezra and Mordecai. The first is that Ben Sira should have placed Zerubbabel among the great men he has mentioned. Certainly, most men in making a list of twenty of the worthies of Israel would not have included him among them. The same might be said of Phinehas and Caleb and Nathan and Adam, and Seth and Shem and perhaps even of Enoch and Noah and Job.

The second is that he should have given eleven verses to Elijah and only two to Jeremiah and one to Ezekiel; three verses to Phinehas and none to Ezra; two to Caleb and only eight verses to Samuel and only one to all the Minor Prophets; and seventeen verses to Aaron and twenty-one to Simon (a non-biblical hero) while giving only five to Moses, one to Nehemiah, and none to Ezra.

The third is that he mentions such men as Caleb and Seth and Shem, while never mentioning by name Gideon and Deborah and Jephthah and Samson; nor Jehoshaphat, Jehoiada, Esther and Ezra; nor any of the twelve Minor Prophets.

Ben Sira certainly did not estimate the Israelitish worthies as Professor Prince does, not as any one of us would

---

<sup>4</sup> For as Ben Sira says in xl ix, 4: Aside from David, Hezekiah, and Josiah, all of the kings had acted corruptly.

do. But what are we going to do about it? Call him an ignoramus? or admit his right of private judgment?

IV. The fourth assumption is that the silence of Ben Sira concerning Daniel shows that the prophet and his book were unknown to him.

This is admittedly true of the LXX and Peshitto versions of Ecclesiasticus, but it is not certain when we look at the original Hebrew text, which has been discovered since Bleek put forth this objection to the early date of Daniel. In chapter xl ix. 10 we read: And I will mention "also the Twelve Prophets; let their bones sprout beneath them". Verse 11 is as follows: **אשר חלימו את יעקב וישעוו**. If we take the first three letters as the relative the sense of the verse will be: "who comforted Jacob and saved him". But if we point the letters as in an a class segholate, the verse would read: "Blessed be they who comforted Jacob and saved him" etc. As the Greek has *παρακαλεῖ* in the singular, we could read: "Blessed be he who comforted Jacob" etc.

The sense of "comfort" for the hiphil of **חָלַם** is supported by Isaiah xxxviii. 16, and by the use of the Aramaic and late Hebrew. Further, as the hiphil of this verb may mean "to cause to dream" (Jer. xxix. 8), or, after the analogy of **חוֹזֵה**, "to show or explain visions" (Is. xxx. 10; Sam. ii. 14), we might translate: "Blessed be he who explained dreams to Jacob" etc.<sup>5</sup> As to the construction and use of **אשר** in the construct before the verbal sentence in the genitive, compare Ecclus. xl viii. 11: "Blessed be he who saw Thee and died". Compare also Psalm lxv. 5, where **אשר** is employed in like manner.

If this verse be taken in the above sense, it would most naturally refer to Daniel.

But let us waive this conjecture, granting for the sake of argument either that Sira did not mention Daniel or that he shows no acquaintance with the book of Daniel, what then? There are three possibilities. First he may have

---

<sup>5</sup> Compare New Hebrew **חָלָם Traumdeuter**.

known the book of Daniel, but not have seen fit to use it; secondly, he may have known about the man Daniel, while not being acquainted with the book; and thirdly, both the book and the man may have been unknown to Ben Sira.

A. Taking these three possibilities in order, let us suppose that Sira was acquainted with the book of Daniel, but did not please to use it. Is there any reasonable way of accounting for such a fact?

This is purely a psychological question having to do with the opinions, feelings, and judgment of Ben Sira himself. He may have been of the opinion that Daniel did not measure up to the standard of the "fathers of the aeon" whose praises he was celebrating. For we must remember that what made the book of Daniel of such supreme importance to the Jews and Christians of later times are its manifest references to Maccabean and New Testament times. To a Jew living at 200 B.C., its message must have been largely closed and sealed. It is hard to see why he should have been specifically mentioned, in view of the failure of Sira to name Samson, Gideon, or Jonah. Besides, with the deliverance from the fiery furnace, the most extraordinary of the miracles mentioned in his book, Daniel personally had nothing to do. As to the failure of the lions to eat him, when cast into their den, the pages of Herodotus, Livy, and of many other ancient authors, are full of just as astounding statements. As to his ability to explain dreams, the Egyptian, Assyrian, and Babylonian kings, Croesus, Xerxes, and Alexander, and indeed, one might say, almost all men of all classes, believed in the significance of dreams and in the power of correct interpretation; so that Sira may have thought that there was no special reason for mentioning Daniel on this account. The equivocal position in which Daniel stood in the Babylonian court may not have been thought by Sira to entitle him to be inscribed in the catalogue of the fathers of his people. He was after all but a slave dancing attendance on a tyrant's will. Besides, so far as is recorded, he never did anything for the

Jews in general, but only accomplished the promotion of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego. Many other Jews must have been known to Sira who had risen high in the courts of heathen kings, and who had done much more for their contemporary Israelites : such for example, as Ezra, Mordecai, Athanaeus, and Joseph the son of Tobias, the last a contemporary of Ben Sira himself. Why should Daniel have been signalized and these not?

Again, a close study of Sira's encomiums on the celebrated men of his nation reveals some noteworthy facts, to wit :

1. From the time preceding Abraham, he names Enoch (perhaps twice), Noah, and apparently Adam, Seth, Enosh, and Shem.
2. From Abraham to Joshua, he names Abraham, Isaac, Israel, Moses, Aaron, Phinehas, Caleb, Joshua, and, as it were as an afterthought, Joseph.
3. From the times succeeding Joshua, he names only Samuel, David, Nathan, Solomon, Elijah, Elisha, Hezekiah, Isaiah, Josiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Nehemiah, and Job; and possibly refers to Ezra.
4. From post-biblical times, he names Simon the High Priest, who served about 280 B.C.
5. He refers to the twelve patriarchs, the judges, and the twelve Minor Prophets without mentioning any one of them by name, except Samuel.
6. If his estimate of the relative importance of the great men he mentions can be derived from the number of verses written about them, they will stand in the following order : the High-priest Simon 21 verses, Aaron 17, Solomon 12, Elijah 11, David 10, Hezekiah 9, Samuel 8, Moses 5, Josiah 4, Abraham 3, Phinehas 3, Elisha 3, Noah 2, Jeremiah 2, Joseph 1 or two, and Isaac, Israel, Nathan, Ezekiel, Zerubbabel, Jeshua, and Nehemiah, one each. The twelve Minor Prophets are honored in but one verse, or less ; Shem, Seth and Adam, in one verse altogether.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Enoch, also, is certainly mentioned in chapter xliv. 16, which reads,

In xlix. 14, the Greek reads: "But upon the earth was no man created like Enoch; for he was taken from the earth." The Peshitto has simply: "Few were created upon earth like Enoch." The Hebrew text as amended by Smend is: **טַעַט נוֹצָר֔ עַל הָאָרֶן כְּחָנָק֔ וְגַם הֵא נִלְקָח֔ פְּנִים**. Thus read, the translation would be: "Few have been formed upon earth like Enoch; and he, also, was taken away bodily."

But, it is to be noted, that the manuscript gives us **כְּחָנָק**, and that the last letter of **נוֹצָר֔** appears to have been added (scheint nachgetragen zu sein).<sup>7</sup> Following the general principle of the original writing of the vowel letters as propounded by Cornill on page 491 of his "Introduction to the Canonical Books of the Old Testament", the text of the first part of the verse might be as follows: **כְּחָנָק . . . . נוֹצָר**. The verse would, then, read: "For a little while thy priest was kept upon the earth; and he, also, was taken away bodily". **טַעַט** would be used adverbially as in Ruth ii. 7, Psalm xxxvii. 10; and **נִלְקָח** would have the same sense as in the probable original of the Ezra-Apocalypse viii. 14. Thus rendered, the verse will refer to Ezra, who may justly be looked upon as the greatest of all the priests. For the belief that Ezra was taken away bodily, compare *Fourth Ezra* xiv. 9, 49, and vi. 26, vii. 28, and viii. 19. In xiv. 9, the voice out of the bush says to Ezra: "Thou shalt be taken up from among men". In xiv. 49, it is said: "Then was Ezra caught away and taken up into the place of such as were like him". In viii. 19 is found: "The beginning of the prayer of Ezra, before he was taken up"; and in vi. 26: "The men who have been taken up, who have not tasted death from their birth, shall appear."

In favor, also, of this latter text and rendering are two important circumstances: first, Enoch has already been

---

according to the Hebrew text: "Enoch walked with God, a sign of knowledge to all generations". The Greek translation reads: "Enoch pleased God and was translated, being an example of repentance to all generations". The Peshitto omits the verse.

<sup>7</sup> Smend *in loco*.

mentioned by Ben Sira in his proper place in chapter xliv. 16; and secondly, Nehemiah has just been referred to in the preceding verse, and we would naturally expect to have Ezra noticed in connection with his great collaborator.

It has already been shown (page 455) that xlix. 10 may possibly contain a reference to Daniel. Job, also, is mentioned in the Peshitto text of xlix. 9, which reads: "And also concerning Job he said, that all his ways were right." The Greek here has: "For he made mention of the enemies under the figure of a cloud." The Hebrew original has: "And also I will mention Job." The only difference between the two readings is that one has בְּנֵי נָבָל whereas the other had אַיִלָּב.

7. It will be observed, further, that our author gives 21 verses to the High Priest Simon, a non-biblical character, and one who is known elsewhere only in two short notices by Josephus; whereas he gives 17 verses to Aaron and only five to Moses. Samuel is honored with 8 verses, and all the other judges with but two. Phinehas is granted as long a notice as Abraham. Hezekiah receives almost as much attention as David and Solomon combined. Caleb is treated with the same consideration as Jeremiah, and receives twice as much notice as Ezekiel and at least twice as much as all the Minor Prophets together.

8. Many persons notable in the history of Israel are not mentioned at all by Ben Sira. Such are, of priests, Abiathar, Jehoiada, Hilkiah, Eliashib and Jaddua; of judges, Gideon, Jephthah, and Samson; of kings, Saul, Asa, Jehoshaphat, Jehu, and Jeroboam II; of prophets, Hosea, Jonah, Haggai, and Zechariah. Besides, all the women, without any exception, are passed over in silence,—Sarah, Rachel, Miriam, Deborah, Ruth, and even Esther.

9. Of the 133 verses employed in the encomiums, 42 are given to the priests, 35 to the kings, 32 (or 33, if we count Job as a prophet) to the prophets, 8 or 9 to the patriarchs, 12 to Joshua and the judges, and two to Zerubbabel and Nehemiah.

10. Further, it will be noted that, with the exception of the doubtful case of Job, all of the "famous men" from Moses onward exercised their activities in Palestine, and had to do with the establishment, defense, or renovation, of the laws, institutions, and polity, of the Jews, with the conquest of the land, or with the building, or restoration, of Jerusalem and the temple. In this connection, Jehoiada, Jehoshaphat, Zechariah, Haggai, and Ezra, might have been mentioned; and also, Mordecai, at least had he labored and lived in Palestine. But Daniel, so far as we know, originated no laws, did not assist in any national movement, did not participate in the return from Babylon, nor in the re-building of the walls of Jerusalem, nor in the re-establishment of the people and of its laws.

11. No one can maintain that Ben Sira failed to mention Daniel on account of not being acquainted with him, or with his book, without maintaining that he was also ignorant of the existence and labors of Ezra. But Ben Sira's knowledge of Nehemiah would seem to make it certain that he knew also of Ezra.

12. Ben Sira's judgment as to what rendered men famous, is certainly odd and eccentric. For example, of the 21 verses of encomium upon the High Priest Simon, 17 are taken up with a description of the beauty of his person and of the ceremonies connected with the service at the altar, and of the blessing which the congregation received at his hands. In the case of Aaron, also, a large part is taken up with a description of his garments. If we compare the ideas of Ben Sira with those of the book of Daniel, we find very substantial reasons why the former may not have deemed Daniel worthy of a place among the famous men of his nation. The greatest things that Daniel ever did were to interpret the dream of Nebuchadnezzar and to explain the writing on the wall of Belshazzar's palace. Now, in the beginning of chapter xxiv, Ben Sira has expressed plainly his opinion of dreams, when he says among other things, that "dreams lift up fools", "whoso regardeth

dreams is like him that catcheth at a shadow and followeth after wind", "divination and soothsaying and dreams are vain", "for dreams have deceived many, and they have failed that put their trust in them".

Again, Daniel expresses his belief in a resurrection, whereas Ben Sira never even hints at such a possibility. The only kind of immortality that he expressly teaches, is the immortality of fame, and of nationality, family, and institutions, such as the covenant and the priesthood. Moreover, Ben Sira never refers to the distinction between clean and unclean foods, or to the praying toward Jerusalem, or to praying three times daily, to fasting, or to a *post mortem* judgment of the world,—all doctrines that distinguish the book of Daniel. With reference to angels, also, Ben Sira never expresses his own belief, merely mentioning them in allusions to the earlier history.

#### SUMMARY

To sum up, it may be said that while it is probable that Ben Sira does not refer to Daniel, nor show any knowledge of his book, yet this is no indication that he was not acquainted with both. For as a matter of fact, he does not purpose to give, nor does he give, a complete list of Israelitish worthies; the ones he does mention being selected and celebrated after a manner peculiar to himself. After the conquest, he praises especially priests, kings, and prophets, to none of which classes did Daniel officially, at least, belong. After the conquest, moreover, he mentions, with the possible exception of Job, none but those whose activities were passed in Palestine. With the exception of Solomon and Isaiah, the writers of the nation are given scant space and praise. And finally, there are special reasons why Daniel should have been passed by Ben Sira, arising from the fact that the doctrines and practices of Daniel were out of harmony with those approved and taught by Ben Sira.

B. Some writers, while maintaining that the book of Daniel was not written till the time of Antiochus Epiphanes,

maintain that the man Daniel was, in the words of Dr. Driver, "a historical person, one of the Jewish exiles in Babylon, who, with his three companions, was noted for his staunch adherence to the principles of his religion, who attained a position of influence at the court of Babylon, who interpreted Nebuchadnezzar's dream and foretold, as a seer, something of the future fate of the Chaldean and Persian empires. Perhaps, written materials were at the disposal of the author; it is at any rate probable that for the descriptions contained in c. 2-7 he availed himself of some work, or works, dealing with the history of Babylon in the 6th century B.C."<sup>8</sup>

In view of the fact that Ben Sira gives his longest encomium to the High Priest Simon, a non-biblical character, it is hard to see how he can have failed to mention Daniel, this well known and distinguished man, even though the book that bears his name had not yet been written. Objections that Ben Sira may have reasonably made to doctrines of the book of Daniel he can not have made in like measure to the historical character of Daniel ii-vi. If we assert that the book of Daniel was not written before 180 B.C., we can no longer compare the silence of Ben Sira with his mention of the authors of the books of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the Twelve; but we must compare this silence with his mention of the great men who, so far as we know, were not authors, that is, with his mention of Caleb, Phinehas, Elijah, Elisha, Josiah, Zerubbabel, and Simon. So that, when we deny the existence of the book of Daniel and admit the knowledge of the man, whether this knowledge had been gained from "written materials", or from oral tradition, we have not escaped the difficulties involved in Ben Sira's silence. We have simply shifted them from the book to the person. For, if this silence disprove the existence of the book, it disproves equally the knowledge of the person. In the opinion of the present writer, the silence of Ben Sira with reference to

<sup>8</sup> LOT, 510, 511.

Daniel neither proves nor disproves anything with regard to either the existence of the book, or his knowledge of the person of Daniel. His silence may have been intentional, or unintentional. It may have been through ignorance, or design. But the reason for it is to be sought in the mind of Ben Sira, and this mind is beyond our ken.

C. Much more consistent is the view of Professor Prince and others, who hold that the silence of Ben Sira with regard to Daniel shows that both the book and the man were unknown to him. When, however, Professor Prince says that the only explanation of this silence "seems to be that the book of Daniel was not known to Sirach", and "had so celebrated a person as Daniel been known, he could hardly have escaped mention in such a complete list of Israel's leading spirits", Professor Prince is, as has been shown above, going beyond what his premises justify.

i. For, first, let us suppose that the book of Daniel was unknown to Ben Sira. What follows? Not necessarily, as Professor Prince concludes, that there was no such book in existence. Here is a fallacy which few writers on Old Testament introduction seem able to avoid. They confound the time of the writing of an Old Testament book with the time of its assumption into the collection of the canon. The New Testament books were presumably all written before the close of the first century A.D. Their acknowledgment as canonical, and their collection into one book, took place many years afterwards. So, the books of the Old Testament may have been written centuries before they were recognized as canonical, or admitted into the collection of the sacred scriptures. Daniel, for example, may have been written in Babylon in the 6th century B.C., and may not have been received officially into the canon of the Palestinian Jews until after its predictions had been so significantly and accurately fulfilled in the events of the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes.

To be sure, according to Josephus, the High Priest Jaddua showed the predictions of the book to Alexander the

Great in 332 B.C. To be sure, also, the author of the First Book of Maccabees represents Mattathias as inciting the Asmoneans to rebellion against Antiochus in 169 B.C., by citing the deliverance of the three children from the flames and of Daniel from the lions' den. But while Jaddua in the fourth century B.C. may have known of the book, and while Mattathias and his hearers may have known about the fiery furnace and the deliverance from the lions in 169 B.C.; it may be possible that Ben Sira, who wrote his work about 180 B.C. was, as Professor Prince and others have brought themselves to believe, entirely ignorant of both the book and the person of Daniel. Jaddua may have known the book. Mattathias and his hearers may have known the person, but for some reason unknown to us Ben Sira may have been unacquainted with either the book or the person of Daniel. But all this does not prove that the book did not exist in the time of Ben Sira, or that the facts recorded in the book of Daniel had not occurred. For the collection of the sacred books to which Ben Sira had access may not have contained the book of Daniel; or, for reasons deemed sufficiently good by him, may not have been acknowledged as canonical. As has been shown above, he may have known the book, but on account of its doctrines, or of the locality in which its deeds were enacted, he may have refused to recognize its authority, or to celebrate its heroes. Or, the book may not have been accessible to him; for it is a mistake to suppose that all of the books recognized as canonical were at that time bound together in a single volume. Dr. Gregory of Leipzig has shown that folios did not come into use till the second century A.D. Before that time, it was the sacred books (*biblia*) that men had, not the holy Bible, or book (*biblion*). The oldest MS of the Hebrew scriptures, whose date is generally accepted, contains only the Prophets. The next oldest has nothing but the Law. Till printing came into vogue, few institutions, or churches, and still fewer individuals, had a complete collection of the books of the Canon. It is not to be

imagined that among the scattered and impoverished Jews of the second century B.C. there were many who were fortunate enough to possess copies of all the Old Testament books. Josephus states that a copy of the Law, which had been laid up in the temple, was carried in the triumphal procession of Titus; but he does not say whether by Law he means only the Pentateuch, or the whole Old Testament. In his Life, section 75, he says that he himself received from Titus as a special mark of his favor, the "holy books" indicating clearly that he considered this gift of the Caesar as a noteworthy concession. The Prologue to Ecclesiasticus affirms that Ben Sira the elder had given himself much to the reading of the Law, and of the Prophets, and of the other books of the fathers. What and how many books these were, he does not state. It is altogether possible that he had not access to a copy of the book of Daniel, and that for this reason his language shows no signs of having been influenced by it. If the book of Daniel had been in circulation in Palestine in his time, it is hardly possible, however, to perceive how something of the principal events and persons described in it could have been utterly unknown to Ben Sira. This knowledge must have seemed to him to be of such a character as not to justify him in placing Daniel among his famous men, especially in view of the fact that he thought best to omit from his list so many others that to us seem equally worthy of mention.

2. Secondly, let us suppose that Ben Sira did not even know that a man called Daniel had ever lived. In answer to this supposition, one might content himself with referring to the fact that Ezekiel twice mentions a Daniel as a wise man of equal standing with Noah and Job. Since Ezekiel wrote in the early half of the sixth century B.C., the Daniel to whom he refers must have lived as early, at least, as that time; and there is no other Daniel known to history, except the Daniel of our book, who can by any possibility have been referred to in such a connection. Josephus, also, treats Daniel as an historical character. This he would not have

done, unless it had been the common opinion of the Jews of his time. Moreover, he and his contemporaries had access to many sources of information which have since ceased to exist. These sources covered the period of the Maccabees. But no one of them gives a hint that anyone had ever suspected that Daniel was a fictitious character, or that the account of him given in his book is not historical.

The author of the First Book of Maccabees, also, considered Daniel to be an historical person; for he says that Mattathias, the father of Judas Maccabaeus, exhorted his adherents in the following words: "Call to remembrance what acts our fathers did in their time; so shall you receive great honor and an everlasting name. Was not Abraham found faithful in temptation, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness? Joseph in the time of his distress kept the commandment, and was made lord of Egypt. Phinees our father in being zealous and fervent obtained the covenant of an everlasting priesthood. Jesus for fulfilling the word was made a judge in Israel. Caleb for bearing witness before the congregation received the heritage of the land. David for being merciful possessed the throne of an everlasting kingdom. Elias for being zealous and fervent for the law was taken up into heaven. Ananias, Azarias, and Misael, by believing were saved out of the flame. Daniel for his innocence was delivered from the mouth of the lions. And thus consider ye throughout all ages, that none that put their trust in him shall be overcome."

The first book of Maccabees records the history of the Jews from 169 to 135 B.C. and is our principal source of information for the events of which it speaks. The speech of Mattathias was, according to the author of First Maccabees, made in 169 B.C. According to the view of those who deny that there ever was a real Daniel, the book named after him was written about June 164 B.C., about five years after the speech was delivered. Is it possible that a reliable author, such as the writer of First Maccabees certainly was, would have put such statements with regard to Daniel and

his companions into a speech made five years before the work of fiction containing the suppositious history of them was written?

Again, how can we account for the fact that the author of Maccabees, if he himself manufactured the speech, should have placed these fictitious characters in the very climax of his heroic appeal? If he had had a suspicion even that they were not real persons, and that there had been no deliverance from the flame and from the lions, would he have finished this magnificent call to patriotism and faith by descending from the thrilling experiences of Abraham, Joseph, Phinehas, Joshua, David, and Elijah,—all bearing directly upon his attempt to stir up his hearers to their noblest endeavors for God and country—by descending, I say, to such bathos as this? Surely, also, the author of this speech must have known that the enthusiasm of the hearers could not be aroused by appealing to the example of men whose names and deeds were unknown to them. If Mattathias made this speech, it shows that he esteemed the traditions about Daniel as being of equal value with those concerning the others to whom he appeals. If the author of First Maccabees composed the speech, and put it into the mouth of Mattathias, he must have thought, at least, that those for whom he wrote his history would acknowledge that Mattathias might have made such a speech, and that his hearers might have understood it. That it is a good speech for the alleged purpose of it, no one can deny. That it accomplished its purpose is equally undeniable. Finally, the author of First Maccabees writes like one who had first hand information of the facts that he records. He probably lived throughout most, if not all, of the stirring times which Daniel predicts and that he describes. Is it not, then, remarkable that if the book of Daniel were first written in 164 B.C., and had been expressly published with the purpose of exciting the flagging energies of the despondent and faithless Jews, that no mention is made in First Maccabees of any such publication, or even of its author?

But no. The references to Daniel and his companions are made in the same way as to Abraham and David, showing clearly, that the author put the sources of Daniel in the same class as the Law and the Prophets.

That the Jews of the first century A.D., also, considered Daniel to be an historical person is abundantly shown, moreover, in the numerous references which the New Testament writers make to the book. It will not do to say that they would have referred to it in the same way and with the same frequency, if they had looked upon it as fiction; for they do not thus refer to Judith, Tobit, and other works of a fictitious character.

Now, against this consentient testimony of the New Testament writers, Josephus, and the Maccabees, as to the existence of a knowledge of Daniel and of his book before the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, what have those who deny this knowledge to advance? Nothing but two opinions: first, that these writers, whose honesty they will probably admit, did not have the opportunity or the intelligence to judge correctly on such subjects; and secondly, that it is impossible that there can have been predictions of such a character as those to be found in the book of Daniel.

I. (1) As to the first of these opinions, it may be remarked, first, with reference to the New Testament writers, that, inspiration aside, they certainly give us the views prevalent among the Jews of their time. Writers like the apostle Paul must have known the history of the Jewish people from the time of the High Priest Simon the Just onward, much better, at least, than any one can know it today. Hostile readers and critics, such as those to whom the epistle to the Hebrews was directed, render it incredible that an educated author, such as he was who wrote this epistle, could have referred to what he considered to be imaginary events and persons in the clauses "stopped the mouths of lions", and "quenched the violence of fire". Whether Paul, or Apollos, or whoever wrote this epistle, he was certainly acquainted with the history of Israel, and

he undeniably meant to give us a list of the real heroes of faith, in order to stimulate his readers to follow their example. Such a stimulus could not have been derived from the supposititious heroes of romance, any more than it could be today; unless, indeed, both writer and readers believed that they were historical. Let our belief in the truthfulness of the cherry tree incident be dissipated, and it will be vain to cite the veracity of the boy Washington to excite the emulation of the youth of America. Let our belief in the reality of the miracles and privations of the saints be destroyed, and these signal events of their lives will at once cease to be ensamples for our conduct and consolation. Let our belief in the fact of the incarnation, or of the resurrection, and in the correctness of the records of the words and deeds of Jesus once be done away, and our appeal to sinners to accept of Jesus as their Lord and Savior will inevitably loose its conviction and its power. These are psychological facts, which the experience of every one will approve as true.

In like manner, we must agree that the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews would not have appealed to imaginary characters and events to support and strengthen the failing faith of his readers. He must, then, himself have believed that Daniel and his companions lived and acted as the book of Daniel asserts that they did. Living within 250 years of the time when some assume that the book of Daniel was written, and at a time of great literary activity, it is scarcely possible that a writer of such intelligence as is displayed throughout the epistle to the Hebrews should not have known whether the heroes that he cites as examples were real or fictitious characters.

(2) Secondly, as to Josephus, we have in him a witness whose honesty and intelligence no one can dispute. His opportunity to learn the facts can alone be controverted. But we have no evidence with regard to what he says about Daniel, to show that he can be effectually controverted. For he lived only about 250 years after the time of the

Maccabees, and all of the earlier part of his life was passed in Palestine. He had access to all of the religious literature of the Jews and to all of the profane literature of the Gentiles, and was thoroughly acquainted with all the laws, institutions, and traditions of his people. Of all ancient historians, none but Polybius and Pliny cite as many authorities, and no one as many archives, as he. No one so often appeals to the best sources of information on the different matters of which he treats. Nor does anyone so persistently defy all critics, nor so consistently marshall the testimony of the original sources.

Now, Josephus treats the book of Daniel as historical, and gives six whole pages of Whiston's translation, embracing all of the tenth and eleventh chapters of Book X of his Antiquities of the Jews, to a narration of the principal events of Daniel's career. In language which cannot be surpassed, he says of him (Book X. XI. 7), "it is fit to give an account of what this man did, which is most admirable to hear; for he was so happy as to have strange revelations made to him, . . . , and now that he is dead, he retains a remembrance that will never fail, for the several books that he wrote and left behind him are still read by us till this time; and from them we believe that Daniel conversed with God. . . . He also wrote and left behind him what made manifest the accuracy and undeniable veracity of his predictions. . . . And indeed, it so came to pass that our nation suffered these things under Antiochus Epiphanes, according to Daniel's vision, and what he wrote many years before they came to pass. In the very same manner, also, Daniel wrote concerning the Roman government, and that our country should be made desolate by them. All these things did this man leave in writing, as God had showed them to him, insomuch that such as read his prophecies and see how they have been fulfilled would wonder at the honor wherewith God honored Daniel, and may thence discover how the Epicureans are in error, who cast Providence out of human life, and do not believe that God takes care of

the affairs of the world, nor that the universe is governed and continued in being by that blessed and immortal nature."

From these citations from Josephus it appears clearly that this careful writer, whose great vocation in life it was to defend the institutions and writers of his nation, and to describe the persons and events of its history, never harbored a suspicion that the book of Daniel was other than historical, or was in any wise different, as a trustworthy source of information, from the other books of the Old Testament, whose records, as Josephus says in his first treatise against Apion, section 6, "had been written all along down to his own times with the utmost accuracy". "For we have not", says he, in section 8, "an innumerable number of books among us, disagreeing from and contradicting one another, but only twenty-two books, which contain the records of all the past times. And of them five belong to Moses, which contain his laws, and the traditions of the origin of mankind till his death. But as to the time from the death of Moses till the reign of Artaxerxes king of Persia, who reigned after Xerxes, the prophets who were after Moses, wrote down what was done in their times in thirteen books. The remaining four books contain hymns to God, and precepts for the conduct of human life." From this last statement of Josephus it is apparent that he classed Daniel among the prophets, and deemed his book of equal authority with the rest.

2. As to the second opinion mentioned above (page 468), that it is impossible that there can have been predictions of such a character as those to be found in the book of Daniel, let it suffice to say here that to one who grants the possibility and the fact of a revelation from God it is unreasonable to lay down the limits and to define the character of that revelation. It is at least probable that God would speak in divers manners through the prophets. No man, be he ever so wise, can say to the All Wise: Thus must Thou have spoken, or not at all. The length, the detailed

description, and the literary form of the revelation, may differ as widely as the truth permits; but they do not affect the truth. God alone can be the judge of how, and when, and where, and to whom, He will reveal His thoughts and plans.

V. The fifth assumption of those who assert that Ben Sira knew nothing about Daniel, is based on the allegation that Ben Sira states that there was no man like Joseph, "whereas the narratives respecting Daniel represent him much like unto Joseph in regard to both the high distinction he attained and the faculties he displayed; and further, the very wording of the narratives in the first part of Daniel is modelled after that of the narratives in Genesis concerning Joseph.<sup>9</sup>

By the method pursued by Dr. Driver in this citation, we could establish, or condemn, almost any proposition ever made. By omitting the qualifying clauses of Ben Sira's statement, he has made him appear to say what he does not say at all. Ben Sira does not make the very questionable assertion that no man like Joseph was ever born; but, that no man was born like Joseph in this respect, that his dead body was mustered (*i.e.*, counted in the muster). In the preceding verse, according to Smend's and Strack's texts of the Hebrew original, he had just said that "few were formed upon earth like Enoch, in that he was taken away bodily". In the 16th verse, he says that no man was born like Joseph in that his body was mustered. The two verses are of the same construction. In each case, the comparison is limited by the second clause of the verse; and the statements of the first clauses, when thus limited, are in both cases perfectly true. At least, it is perfectly true concerning Joseph.<sup>10</sup> For of no other man could it be said that his dead body had been preserved as was that of Joseph in Egypt, and mustered as his was among the embattled hosts of

<sup>9</sup> See Driver, *Daniel*, pages 17 and 64.

<sup>10</sup> In the case of Enoch it might be doubted whether in view of Elijah's ascension it could be said that he alone of all men had been translated bodily.

Israel. In this particular, Joseph was and will be forever unlike all other men; and it is in this particular that Ben Sira says that Joseph was unlike all other men. He does not say a word, or give a hint, as to his meaning to suggest or insinuate that no one was like Joseph "as to both the high distinction he attained and the faculties he displayed".

Nor will Dr. Driver's assertion derive any support from the Greek version of Ecclesiasticus, which reads: "Neither was there a man born like unto Joseph, a governor of his brethren, a stay of his people, whose bones were regarded of the Lord." Nor will the Syriac Version help him; for it reads: "And no mother has borne a child like Joseph, in that his body was assembled (*i.e.*, gathered to his fathers) in peace."

As to the further part of the citation from Dr. Driver, that "the very wording of the narratives in the first part of Daniel is modelled after that of the narratives of Genesis concerning Joseph", it has absolutely nothing to do with the question of the date of the composition of the book of Daniel. Since, according to Dr. Driver himself, the whole history of Joseph belongs to the so-called Jehovistic and Elohistic documents (LOT, 17), and since critics agree that both of these documents were certainly finished before 750 B.C. (LOT, 122), it is perfectly obvious that a writer of the sixth century B.C. may have imitated the account in Genesis as readily as one who lived in the second century B.C.

Moreover, in only three particulars can the life of Daniel be said to resemble that of Joseph. They were both captives at the court of a mighty foreign monarch; they both rose to positions of pre-eminence at these respective courts; and they both rose because of their skill in the interpretation of dreams. In all other respects their lives differ as much as it is possible for human lives, especially of men in somewhat similar circumstances, to differ. But finally and chiefly, it is to be noted that it is not to one of these resemblances, but to one of the differences, between Joseph

and Daniel, that Ben Sira calls our attention; that is, that something was done with the body of Joseph such as never happened in the case of any other man. For when Joseph was about to die, he gave commandment concerning his bones, saying to the children of Israel: God will surely visit you, and ye shall carry up my bones from hence (*Genesis* l. 25). In *Exodus* xiii. 19, we are told that Moses took the bones of Joseph with him, when he went out of the land of Egypt; and in *Joshua* xxiv. 32, it is said that the children of Israel buried these bones, which they had brought all the way from Egypt, in a parcel of ground in Shechem which became the inheritance of the children of Joseph.

This was the unique, the unparalleled, event in the history of Joseph. It was recognized as such by Ben Sira in his day, and by the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews in his. And it must be recognized by us today. In this one respect there was no one like him among all the children of Israel, nor ever has been, nor ever can be among all the sons of men.

### CONCLUSION

Having thus considered fully all of the objections to the early date of the book of Daniel made on the ground of the silence of Ben Sira with respect to it, there seems to be no sufficient reason for doubting the conclusion that notwithstanding this silence the book of Daniel may have been in existence before 180 B.C.

*Princeton, New Jersey.*

ROBERT DICK WILSON.

## REVIEWS OF RECENT LITERATURE

---

### PHILOSOPHICAL LITERATURE

*Genetic Theory of Reality:* Being the Outcome of Genetic Logic as Issuing in the Aesthetic Theory of Reality Called Pancalism. With an Extended Glossary of Terms. By JAMES MARK BALDWIN, Ph.D., Hon. D.Sc. (Oxford, Geneva), Hon. LL.D. (Glasgow), Foreign Correspondent of the Institute of France. G. P. Putnam's Sons: New York and London. The Knickerbocker Press, 1915. Pp. xvii, 335. \$2.00.

*Personalism and the Problems of Philosophy:* An Appreciation of the Work of Borden Parker Bowne. By RALPH TYLER FLEWELLING. Introductory Chapter by Rudolf Eucken. The Methodist Book Concern: New York, Cincinnati. Pp. 207. \$1.00 net.

American philosophy has attained to self-consciousness, and has issued its declaration of independence. The thinker of the New World is no longer content to echo by way of exposition what has been already said—and better said—on the other side of the water. The work of philosophers such as James, Royce, Baldwin, Ormond, Dewey and Bowne shows that American philosophy has reached its constructive stage, and is ready to make its own contribution toward the solution of philosophic problems. American students of philosophy have been gratified to notice the deep impression made by James' critical and constructive work upon foreign thinkers; Baldwin's theory of "genetic modes" is believed by one of his disciples to underly the more famous theory of creative evolution; and Eucken would assign to Bowne a high place among the thinkers of his time.

Professor Baldwin's *Genetic Theory of Reality* is the culmination of his previous studies in psychology, ethics, logic, and aesthetics. It is "the author's matured contribution to the theory of reality—the philosophy to which his professional life of study, teaching, and writing has led him." That he is well fitted for the task undertaken in this his latest and most ambitious work will appear from a list of his published writings, which testify to his prodigious industry and cover almost every department of the philosophical field. He is best known as the author of a standard text-book on psychology, as the editor of the *Dictionary of Philosophy* and, for many years, of the *Psychological Review*, as an exponent, with Osborn and Lloyd Morgan, of the method of "organic selection" in evolution, and as a leader in the study of the problems of mental development. The present volume is the intended conclusion of the three previous volumes issued under the title of

*Thought and Things or Genetic Logic* (vol. i., "Functional Logic," 1906; vol. ii., "Experimental Logic," 1908; vol. iii., "Interest and Art, Genetic Epistemology, 1911). The results reached in these volumes are constantly appealed to, and the reviewer could wish that his acquaintance with their argument were less superficial.

The *Genetic Theory of Reality* is said to contain an Introduction to Philosophy, but it presupposes too advanced a stage of study and demands too close and sustained a degree of attention to recommend it to the beginner. In the closeness of his reasoning, the subtlety of his thought and his use of a technical vocabulary in part coined by himself, Professor Baldwin appeals to the professional student rather than to the more general reader; and his works, whatever their ultimate influence may be, can scarcely hope to be as popular as those of James and Bergson have been. It must not be supposed, however, that Professor Baldwin is lacking in graces of style or that he cannot express himself with clearness and vigor. What could be better, for instance, than his "short method" with the materialist: "We know matter in motion and we infer that its properties are such that our minds and our knowledge are secondary and derived products. Even should we admit such a contention, the fact would remain that such a thing as knowledge is present in the real, and that it is only by appealing to knowledge that the unreality of mind can be proved" (pp. 180-181). Or take this statement of a problem which has vexed modern philosophy: "To deny the trans-subjective reference [the extra-mental reality of other bodies], while retaining the subjective point of view, therefore, is to cut off the *inter-subjective*—to deny knowledge of other persons or communication with them" (p. 182).

The theory of reality which he calls Pancalism has been for some time in Professor Baldwin's mind, as is shown by quotations from his published writings. In 1902 he said: "Nothing can be [finally] true without being beautiful, and nothing can be in any high sense good without being beautiful;" and two years later he said that "the dualisms of 'theoretical and practical,' 'mind and body,' 'inner and outer,' 'freedom and necessity,' all merge to the vanishing point in the aesthetic" (pp. vii, viii, n). Professor Baldwin would find reality in the immediacy of feeling as opposed to rational and volitional processes. The aesthetic experience frees from the limitations of thought and "brings a new equilibrium to the whole mental life. It negates the exclusive claims of rational and voluntaristic processes alike, and restores to the immediacy of feeling its dignity and value" (p. 24). In one's enjoyment of a work of art "he is not now concerned with the intellectual interest of finding something true; nor with the practical interest of finding something good; but with the self-realizing interest of finding something that absorbs and completes the self. After straying in the fields of exploration, and struggling in the morasses that lie before the palaces of duty, he yields himself to the spell of the home, where everything is familiar, where everything is wholesome, and above all where everything is his own." (p. 270).

Pancalism is a theory of "affectivism," and a theory of immediacy. In opposition to rationalism and voluntarism it holds that it is in feeling, or more specifically in aesthetic contemplation, that we enjoy our fullest revelation of reality. Access to the real presence, denied to thought and to will, is granted to feeling when exercised in the contemplation of the beautiful. Reality, defined as "what we mean by reality" (p. 227), is most fully disclosed to the aesthetic consciousness, and is revealed in those

"sensations sweet,  
*Felt* in the blood, and felt along the heart."

Pancalism as a theory of immediacy is opposed to those mediation theories which would reach reality through the medium of ideas. Alike the logical mode of apprehending reality as a sphere of neutral objectivity to be reached by means of ideas, and the practical mode of apprehending it as a good to be attained through certain means, do not bring us into direct relation to reality; and each mode discloses at best only an incomplete aspect of the real. As a theory of immediacy Pancalism is to be distinguished from primitive or a-logical immediacy, which holds that in a certain direct awareness consciousness has its closest contact with reality. The mere "blooming confusion" of un-ordered sensation, or the *élan* of pure duration, would without further elaboration be mere contacts without meaning. Why realize something that amounts to nothing? If, in order to give meaning to this primitive awareness, we read something into it or extract something from it, the theory of primitive immediacy loses its character. But Pancalism is not, on the other hand, a theory of hyper-logical or transcendent immediacy, in which the data of consciousness are not the low things of sensation but the "high things," the universals of thought and the absolutes of value. Here again the criticism is made that the absolute, or self, or spiritual principle disclosed by intuition in the theories of this type is always empty and formal apart from the content given it by experience. As primitive immediacy was blind, therefore, the immediacy of transcendence is empty apart from the filling it receives from concrete experience of the mediate type.

Professor Baldwin believes that in aesthetic appreciation we have a synthetic immediacy in which the dualisms of self and object and of the true and the good are reconciled. Personality is often used as itself a principle of synthesis, but it is objected that here the dualism, for instance, of thought and will is not overcome. We can say "in the beginning was the word," or "in the beginning was the act." The mere expansion of personality accomplishes nothing, for in this process each of the factors in personality loses its identity. "In the end the colorless white light of formal identity succeeds to the colored rays of the spectrum of personal experience. As an abstraction, the super-personal loses both the concrete immediacy of the mystic's feeling and the qualitative concreteness of the knowledge and will postulated by intellectualists and voluntarists" (pp. 199-200). Professor Baldwin

seeks a synthesis in which the dualisms are neither retained in their opposition nor swallowed up in the super-personal. He finds a "reconciling immediacy" in aesthetic contemplation in which the opposition of thought and will, of the self with its interests and the object and with its independence, is reconciled. "The life processes forget their quarrels and divorces and go forward in the pursuit of the true and the enjoyment of the good, both present in the synthesis of the beautiful—all because the necessity of the one realm and the freedom of the other are made elements of a complete experience. The larger self of contemplation finds the double predicates, united and completed, in the one object" (p. 264). If we ask what it is which affects the synthesis, the answer is, the "semblant imagination." Pancalism is thus a theory of synthetic immediacy; it is a "constructive affectivism" which "shows the way by which feeling may be informed, not remaining blind, but seeing all things *sub specie pulchritudinis*" (p. 312).

In an instructive review of the course of philosophic thought Professor Baldwin finds important anticipations of his own doctrine. With Plato, God the supreme idea is also the supreme good; but it is reserved for feeling in the form of the divine love to realize the idea of God. The Platonic love is thus an affective mode of reconciliation having important aesthetic value. In Aristotle this reconciliation passes from the status of feeling to that of theory. God as pure form or actuality is apart from the worlds, but these are held in place by love to God. "In return, God dwells upon the universe as upon a work of art, a completed whole in which the ideal of the aesthetic imagination is presented in sensible form" (p. 206). Grounds were suggested by Kant for finding a union of will and reason in feeling, and for finding this feeling present in the exercise of the aesthetic judgment. In his *Critique of Judgment* Kant intimated "a mode of reconciliation of thought and nature, or as he puts it of 'nature and freedom,' in the domain of feeling, in the judgment of aesthetic taste" (p. 208). Schelling again found in aesthetic contemplation a synthesis of the factors recognized as urgent in the philosophy of his time. In art the spirit attains the intuition by which it realizes its identity with nature; and in aesthetic enjoyment "a spiritual intuition breaks down the opposition between the theoretical and the practical, and brings the spirit into consciousness of its unity with itself" (p. 212). A. T. Ormond's *Foundations of Knowledge* is mentioned as the most interesting of recent attempts to deal with the reconciling function of the art consciousness.

The modern deadlock, which has become acute, between the intellectualists and the voluntarists is used as a timely argument in favor of an aesthetic theory of reality. Neither knowledge nor practice, it appears, can be permanently subordinated to the other. Knowledge is instrumental to will and will is instrumental to knowledge. We cannot know unless we will to know, and cannot will unless we know what to will. The need for a reconciling or synthetic theory is there-

fore urgent, and certainly the present moment, with its wide-spread revolt against intellectualism and its new interest in the study of mysticism and the philosophy of art, is a timely one for the suggestion of a theory which contends that the nearest approach to reality is in feeling, and that "in aesthetic contemplation we have the nearest approach to what reality means" (*Thought and Things*, vol. iii, p. 257).

Professor Baldwin's brilliant attempt, supported by all the resources of his knowledge of psychology, biology and anthropology, to subordinate the True and the Good to the Beautiful will naturally be criticized from two opposite standpoints. The moralist will resent the intimation that the artist or the lover of beauty gains a nearer access to reality than the strenuous man who is engaged with the "stern realities of life," and wins in the moral struggle. Conduct, the moralist will insist, is three fourths of life, and the sense for beauty can claim no precedence over the sense for conduct. This criticism in part forestalled in the author's former work: "Is reality thus reached in aesthetic contemplation?—is this state more than a luxury of the mind, wherein it indulges in a sort of retreat from the heat and burden of the day, and refreshes itself for further strenuous endeavor? My point is just that it is a view of reality; that here is the immediacy that follows upon and completes the mediations of opposed cognitive and conative process" (*Thought and Things*, vol. iii., p. 256). The motto of Pancalism, *τὸ καλὸν πᾶν*, reminds us of the fact that the Greeks, as Holm in his History says, were so ardent in their pursuit of the beautiful "that the same word served from earliest times to denote their moral ideal." Another writer, Mahaffy, remarks: "I am not sure that the perfect appreciation of the beautiful has as yet, in any society, implied what it ought to imply, the keenest pursuit of the good" (*Survey of Greek Civilization*, p. 212). Perhaps it would be admitted that the contemplation of the beautiful in which we gain the fullest revelation of reality is the contemplation not of beauty simply but of moral beauty, or beauty of soul, or the beauty of holiness. But in that case it could be said that criteria from the sphere of ethics are taken over into that of aesthetics, and that consequently the good is no longer subordinated to the beautiful.

The intellectualist, again, will scarcely rest quiet under the implication that metaphysics is to be subordinated to aesthetics. Just as the intellectualist and the voluntarist "cut under" each other, it might be asserted that the intellectualist can cut under the "affectivist," whose point of view is said to be not ontological or metaphysical but "genetic and psychological" (pp. 220 ff.). When it is said, for example, as it is in italics, that in the last analysis reality "is what we mean by reality" (p. 227), or that "we realize the real in achieving and enjoying the beautiful" (p. 277), it may be asked whether the beautiful is not an abstraction apart from the concrete persons—the "we"—who achieve and enjoy it. A more subtle point is raised when Professor Baldwin admits that in the contemplation of a work of art the dualism between

the individual knower and the object known (the "extra-psychic reference") is not overcome, but contends that, since the work of art is appreciated as having the same meaning and value "for all competent observers" (p. 297), and since the individual feels himself thus to be organ "of the universal taste which works in him" (p. 298), therefore the aesthetic consciousness does not recognize the separateness of the object from all experience (in the sense of the "trans-subjective reference"). The reference to a universal standard of taste brings the object of art in a sense within the range of experience, and the aesthetic experience thus "abrogates the trans-subjective reference which would make of the real something separate from experience altogether" (p. 209). It is hard to see in this exposition how the aesthetic judgment has any superiority, in the matter of doing away with the opposition of the self and its object, to the theoretical or the practical reason. An object is known as being "the same for all competent observers," and it has even been assumed that the knowledge of material objects was "social" in its origin. Again in ethics there is reference to an over-individual or universal standard of conduct. In all three cases this social reference brings up the dualism between the self or experienter and the other selves who exist, if they exist at all, outside of that self's experience. If these other selves exist at all, it would seem, their reality must be ontological or metaphysical rather than merely psychological; they obstinately "haunt the house" of any subjective or merely experiential or non-metaphysical theory of reality, and aesthetics does not help us at all in solving the problem of how we come to be persuaded of their existence. The practical reason might have something to say, if it be true, as has been lately asserted, that "an ineradicable sense of the value of others requires that they, too, be real" (*Hocking, Meaning of God*, p. 365).

A question which will interest many readers is, How is Pancalism related to theism? There are hints which might be used (in a different way from Mr. Balfour in his *Theism and Humanism*) in the development of an aesthetic argument for God, as when it is said that "if the world is to be artistic, beautiful, it cannot be incoherent, disorganized, radically pluralistic" (p. 308). Further there are many points of contact between "constructive affectivism" and the systems of mysticism, primitive and refined, which are passed in review. If reality is to be found in feeling, there are many who will contend that it is more fully disclosed in religious feeling than in the aesthetic consciousness. This seems to be Professor Hocking's opinion when he says: "The work of religion is a perpetual parentage; that of the Arts is a perpetual dependence" (*Op. cit.* p. 23). On the whole the theistic element in the *Genetic Theory of Reality* is not as prominent as it was in some of the author's earlier work. In the present work for example, it is said: "God, if a concrete person, is actual but not ideal; if an ideal, he is not an actual person—that is the religious dilemma. Whichever is taken for real, the other is merely postulated. The super-

personal becomes either merely personal or quite impersonal, a social fellow or an 'unknown God'" (p 260). Compare with this the statement in Professor Baldwin's earlier work, *Social and Ethical Interpretations* (4th ed., 1906): "The subjective movement whereby the ejective ideal of the religious life is constituted and given real existence and personality, is essential, at each stage of ethical progress, to the continued erection of the subjective ethical ideal itself. . . . Religious faith and with it religious institutions, therefore, are indispensable to humanity, because they represent normal and essential mental movements. They are necessary at once to ethical competence and to ethical progress" (p. 452).

Mr. Flewelling, as a disciple of the late Professor Bowne, wishes to call attention to the value of his master's work, and to express "the deep love and respect felt by one whose intellectual horizons were enlarged by the touch of a master in the realm of thought." Bowne is described as the antagonist of naturalism and the stout champion of a theistic philosophy. His relation to earlier thinkers such as Kant, Spencer and Lotze, as well as to contemporary philosophers such as James, Bergson and Eucken, is reviewed in such a manner as to give the reader an insight into the main problems of modern thought. A sentence from Bowne is worth quoting: "An imperfect God is none—A fairly good God we cannot abide. We can be satisfied with nothing less than the supreme and the perfect. Hence it is that the Christian thought of God wins its way. It is the only one worthy of God or of man."

WM. HALLOCK JOHNSON.

*Lincoln University, Pa.*

---

## APOLOGETICAL THEOLOGY

*Basic Ideas in Religion or Apologetic Theism.* By RICHARD WILDE MICON, M.A., D.D., Late Professor of Theology and Apologetics at The Theological Seminary in Virginia and formerly at the Philadelphia Divinity School. Edited by PAUL MICON, M.A., B.D., Secretary for Theological Seminaries International Committee Young Men's Christian Association. Association Press. New York; 124 East 28th Street. London: 47 Paternoster Row, E. C. 1916. 8vo.; pp. xxii, 496.

This is a posthumous work. Dr. Micon died in June, 1912, and this book was not published until February, 1916. Though without his revision, it is however, essentially his own composition. It is made up of his lectures on Apologetic Theism delivered by him during his two professorships, which covered a period of twenty years. The notes on these lectures he had himself reviewed and arranged. In this task he was assisted by his son, who shortly after his death undertook to

complete it. That he had ample material on which to draw appears in his statement, that he worked over in the preparation of this volume "approximately twelve hundred sheets of type-written notes by Prof. Micon himself; that in addition, he had as his guide in the development of the argument the "Syllabus" of sixty-four pages issued by the professor himself to his students, and the "Manual," a book of one hundred and sixty-four large pages edited by students from their shorthand class-room notes in 1907, and carefully revised by Dr. Micon before it went to press; and that, lastly, he had his own class room notes recording the lectures as he heard them in 1910-11. That the editor has made most faithful use of this ample material is evident on every page of this large volume. He has given three years of almost unremitting toil to the endeavor to reproduce his father's views as nearly as possible in his father's words, and to say that he has succeeded would not be praise enough were there any higher to give. One cannot help comparing the book before us with the "Apologetics" and "The System of Christian Theology" of Prof. Henry B. Smith, D.D., LL.D., which were prepared in much the same manner; but which, though rich and correct in matter, afford no idea of the style of that great writer as well as profound theologian. Indeed, Mr. Micon has performed his difficult task in all respects with such signal ability that we cannot refrain from joining the many in his own communion who are urging him to bring out his lamented father's writings on Christian Dogmatics.

For works like these ought not through any accident of death to be neglected. This is certainly, because evidently, true of the one under review. The controversy which it enters and which it would terminate is fundamental. It is also the question of the hour. In the words of the author, "This is no longer whether a book of the Bible is genuine. It is no longer whether miracles are possible. It is no longer whether supernatural Christianity can be recognized as true. It is whether there be or be not a supernatural at all. It is whether the conception of God is any longer compatible with that conception of nature at which the scientist has now arrived. . . . The scepticism of our age . . . is concerned mainly with the question whether religion has a right to exist. The very possibility of faith, therefore, depends on our world-view, on a philosophy which shall find place in the cosmos for God as Lord and for man as spirit."

But our author does more than discern and define the question which just now is of supreme importance. His answer is as clear as comprehensive, and as satisfactory, as it is to the point. His book falls into two parts. Part I demonstrates the "Idea of God"; Part II the "Spiritual Idea of Man." Part I itself consists of two parts. The first is positive and confirms the reality of the universal idea of God from the "Witness of History"; from the "Witness of the Intellect" as presented in the Cosmological Argument, the Teleological Argument, and the Anthropological Argument; from the "Witness of Aesthetics"

or of the "Beautiful and the Sublime"; and from the "Witness of Intuition" or that of the Spirit to God, as "Real Being, as Supreme Reason, and as Moral Perfection." Part second discusses and refutes the "Denials of God" or the antitheistic theories: first, the "Philosophic" or those based on consciousness, as the various forms of Pantheism and, second, the Scientific or those based on sensation, as Naturalism and Atheism. Part II also falls into two parts. The first is positive and establishes the spiritual idea of man from the "Universal Belief in the Soul," from "Philosophic Analysis of the Science of this Belief" in consciousness of the essential difference between mind and body, ego and world," in the ineradicable conviction of personal identity, and in the will, the expression of personality; from the "Witness of Conscience to Personality and Immortality;" and from the "Witness of the Heart as seen in the Poets." Part second takes up and sets aside the "Denials of the Spiritual Idea of Man"; first, "Denials of Freedom," scientific, philosophic, and theological; secondly, "Denials of Conscience"; and, thirdly, "Denials of Ontology." An "Appendix" of some eighty pages follows this argument, consisting of notes explanatory of the text and, if possible, more valuable than the text. Then comes a well chosen "Bibliography" which should be specially useful to the student, as it aims, not so much at completeness, as at giving the best of up-to-date works. A very full and admirable "Index" closes the volume.

Where all is very good it is usually difficult to distinguish the best. It is so in this case. Nevertheless, the reviewer ventures to express himself as specially impressed by the helpfulness of the author's treatment:

1. Of the Miracle. This he regards, not as a violation of the natural order, but as "a special act of the ever-present and immanent divine Will on which that order depends." The miracle takes place when God acts directly instead of through the forces of nature, and God did so act to call men to hear his Son. "If Christ be the Son of God, and God be really the maker of the world, we might well ask why did not God give a sign in Christ to connect the visible world with the invisible?"

2. Of prayer, and specially of prayer for temporal mercies. With almost unique clearness our author shows that "the will of God acts like the will of man by causing variable combinations of invariable forces. To give rain to a particular section of the country ought to be possible to God without causing any violation of the laws of meteorology, for it merely involves perfect control of all the conditions governing rainfall." Thus, while on the one hand, he shows that we ought not to ask God to set aside the laws of nature or even to work a miracle, he brings out so clearly as to make us feel as well as believe that "there is room for the answer of all wise and true prayer, even though our limited knowledge and insufficient powers of observation keep us from understanding all of God's action."

3. Of "evolution in relation to theism." It is here, possibly, that Dr.

Micon is at his best. He would seem to have had a special as well as a general knowledge of the whole subject of evolution. In his view organic evolution, at any rate, not only yields itself to but even demands a theistic interpretation. Indeed, he holds that it is only thus that we can explain mitosis, or the structural propagation of the cell through division; and embryological growth along unvarying lines in each species. He concludes his discussion of the subject in the words of the veteran evolutionist Mr. Alfred Russell Wallace in his latest book, "The World of Life": "In the present work I recur to the subject after forty years of further reflection, and I now uphold the doctrine that not man alone, but the whole World of Life, in almost all its varied manifestations, leads us to the same conclusion—that to afford any rational explanation of its phenomena, we require to postulate the continuous action and guidance of higher intelligences."

4. Of "the scientific spirit and method." While admitting the necessity of this in its own sphere, our author points out clearly and fearlessly the evils and the dangers of it even there. These he shows to be, the "tendency to despise practical utility and to praise pure science at the expense of applied science; over specialization, which makes vision narrow; and positivism, which is the danger of confining all possible knowledge of reality to sense perception; and these charges he justifies by an appeal to the historian Gibbon and the philosopher William James.

5. Of "the new theory of matter." The discussion here is strikingly fresh and modern, but equally confirmatory of theism. Indeed, "the electrotonic theory of matter gives us an analogy for the study of Creation. All matter in the last analysis is force, and the points at which force acts to a centre become manifest as matter. Some have called these centres of energy 'vortices' or 'whirlpools,' but such names add nothing to what we have learned from modern science about the atom. God is the source of all energy. On the divine force of the universe He impresses 'the dance of harmony.' Before his word goes forth, we call the energy nothing, for to us it would be nothing if unordered. God conducts the process, but God is not the process. God's immanent presence sustains the force in orderly harmonious ways of working. As a great musician plans an entire sonata in his mind and then gives life and body to it by playing it, even so, but without any instrument, is the marvelous universe embodying through Will the thought of the Divine Mind."

6. Of the witness of the heart in the poets. This he regards as "the ontological argument for man's spiritual being, for the great poets give worthy utterance to the unspoken feelings and convictions which lie hidden in the common heart; and in his development of this argument he evidences an acquaintance with and an appreciation of practical literature which is as rare among theologians, and especially among apologists, as it is important for them.

This remark suggests what is, perhaps, both *the characteristic and the*

excellence of Prof. Micon's work, and that is his mastery of the best that has been said and of almost all that has been said on his subject. Prof. Francis T. Russell, D.D., of the General Theological Seminary, once wrote of him, "If you can name anything of note that he might be expected to have read for the last twenty years, he has read it." In similar view Rev. Charles H. Hall, D.D. of Holy Trinity Church, Brooklyn, wrote, "He is, and I emphasize this, the best read man of his age in the church, and has at his tongue's end the stores of acquisition in theology and literature which have been gained by years of faithful and unremitting study." That these encomiums are not extravagant, the book under review is the proof.

And yet the reviewer would not give the impression that he regards it faultless. Indeed, there are two defects so serious that he is constrained at least to point them out:

1. Our author's conception of Christianity. His position is that "*Christianity is essentially the response of the spirit in faith and self-surrender to the revelation of God in Christ, and not the conclusion of any process of intellectual analysis and reasoning*" (italics his), though such work of the intellect is indispensable to the religious leader who would sympathize with the sad questionings of honest doubt and meet the assault of philosophic and scientific unbelief" (p. x $\frac{1}{2}$ ). This description is true in what it affirms, but false in what it denies. "*Christianity is essentially the response of the spirit in faith and self-surrender to the revelation of God in Christ,*" but it is not this only. It is also, and just as much, what our author says that it is not; namely, "*the conclusion of a process of intellectual analysis and reasoning.*" Indeed, religion is an affair of "the whole man"; and, hence, even in the case of the child or the savage it involves the intellect of the child or the savage in so far as that has been developed. Consequently, the conclusion drawn as to the sphere and purpose of apologetics is radically wrong. It is not "*indispensable simply to the religious leader who would sympathize with the sad questionings of honest doubt and meet the assault of philosophic and scientific unbelief.*" Doubtless, this is one of its functions, but it is the least of them. Its real work is to develop the rational side of Christianity, by "*bringing every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ,*" and this is its real work because Christianity is essentially rational as well as emotional and voluntary, and because man is so constituted that the emotional and voluntary in him presuppose and depend on the rational. Christianity will never be what she ought to be, nor even apologetics come to her own, until this is both perceived and appreciated.

2. Our author's doctrine of freeagency. This is what is called "*the self-determination of the will*" or the power of the will, not only to confirm character by its decisions, but to "*form character out of self.*" It emphasizes the influence of motives and of character as constituting motives, but it holds that in the last analysis the secret of the moral life is in the self or will and not in the character which it expresses.

What is this, however, but a new and disguised form of the old theory of "indeterminism" or the "indifference of the will?" How can this be held consistently with theism? To be God, God must do "according to his will in the army of heaven and among the inhabitants of the earth;" but how can he do this, if the inhabitants of the earth must be free in the sense that even he may not or cannot determine them? So far as we can see, Dr. Micon does not answer, and does not really try to answer, this question. What he says is, "After all, why should the creation of beings with a real though partial freedom and independence be an *absolute impossibility?* It is certainly the only view which makes the world a real place—which makes the whole labor of history more than a shadowy fight or aimless phantasmagoria." But is this so? It would be if the determinism advocated were mechanical and so necessary in its operation. With all that our author says, and says so well, in refutation of this we are in heartiest accord. Will it, however, be so if the determinism be spiritual rather than mechanical, by means of motives and persuasion rather than by means of external constraints and force, by means of final causes rather than by means of efficient causes? In both cases the determination will be equally certain: but in the former case, the agent will do what he wants to do and because he wants to do it, and so he will be free; whereas in the latter, he will do what he must do and because he must do it, whether he wants to or not, and so he cannot be free. In a word, the certainty itself of the result has nothing to do with the freedom of the agent. That depends on whether the result is secured through his own choice and action rather than against them or without them. In this way, too, our intuitive conviction of freedom, of which Dr. Micon rightly makes so much, is satisfied. Our conviction is that we really initiate our own acts and that we do this as we want to. This is what is needed, and all that is needed, to keep the "labor of history from being only a shadowy fight or aimless phantasmagoria." It is tremendously real because *we* do the fighting and *ourselves* choose the side on which we will fight. It does not depend on anything so highly speculative as whether we could really want to be other than we want to be.

WILLIAM BRENTON GREENE, JR.

Princeton, N. J.

*Comparative Religion, Its Adjuncts and Allies.* By LOUIS HENRY JORDAN, B.D. (Edin.), Member of The Institut Ethnographique International, Paris, Associate Editor of 'The Review of Theology and Philosophy,' Author of 'Comparative Religion: Its Genesis and Growth,' 'The Study of Religion in The Italian Universities,' etc., etc. Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press: London, Edinburgh, Glasgow, New York, Toronto, Melbourne, Bombay, 1915. 8vo; pp. xxxii, 574.

In this elaborate volume Mr. Jordan has given another and signal proof of his industry and enthusiasm in introducing, defining and pro-

moting the study of the science of Comparative Religion. His first treatise, "Comparative Religion: Its Genesis and Growth," was published in 1905 and was very favorably noticed in this Review for July, 1906. This was followed by "Comparative Religion: A Survey of its Recent Literature," Vol. I: 1905-1909—also reviewed in this Review for Jan., 1911. Next comes the work before us. Shortly is to be expected a volume of six hundred pages on "Comparative Religion: Its Meaning and Value"; and in preparation is another of equal size on "Comparative Religion: Its Principles and Problems." Announcement is also made of a further book entitled "Comparative Religion: A Survey of Its Recent Literature," Vol. II: 1910-1913, as "ready," but "temporarily postponed. In addition to all these, our author has published two "Occasional Papers and Lectures on Comparative Religion"; viz., "Comparative Religion: Its Method and Scope" and "Comparative Religion: Its Origin and Outlook": and he is about to publish two others; viz., "Comparative Religion: Its Range and Limitations," and "Comparative Religion: Its Constructive Capabilities." Besides all this he is busily both editing and helping in the writing of a series of "handbooks" on "The Study of Religion in the Universities of Europe and America;" and as though all this were not enough, he is thinking out three "Projected Publications"; viz., "The Christian Religion, A Comprehensive Estimate, based directly and exclusively upon Researches in Comparative Religion"; "A Comparative Survey of the Origin, Texts, Organization, and Ethical Structure of the Religions of Mankind"; and "Studies, Impressions, and Reflection: A Travelling Student's Retrospect." Was ever science introduced so magnificently? Verily, if the science of Comparative Religion has been late in coming to her own, she has fully come to it now. We congratulate Mr. Jordan on his great achievement. We hope that he will be spared to complete his immense plan.

For the quality and significance of his work have not been impaired by its volume. This we showed to be true of his first book, "Comparative Religion: Its Genesis and Growth," which is now entering on its second edition; and this must become evident to all who will examine the work under consideration. Nowhere else shall we find so good a description and so just an appraisement of the "Avenues of Approach" to the study of Comparative Religion; Anthropology, Ethnology, Sociology, Archaeology, Mythology, Philology, Psychology, the History of Religions. Nowhere else shall we discover so detailed an account of the "transition" of Comparative Religion from the dream of a few that she was to the science for the many that she has become, as this transition appears in and has been effected by "The Evolution of a Scientific Method," "Apologetic Treatises," "Translation of Representative Portions of Sacred Texts," "Transactions of Congresses and Learned Societies," "Encyclopaedias, etc.,," "Periodical Literature," and "Centres of Subsidiary Study." Nowhere else shall we look for a clearer definition of the "Area" and the "Scope" of Comparative Re-

ligion. And certainly the "Analytical Index" of "Authors," of "Subjects," and of "Bibliographies" could not be improved. It is a triumph in itself. It puts at immediate command every topic that emerges in the whole discussion. Yet not in all this do we touch what gives this volume the chief value. Its supreme helpfulness lies in this, that it is a virtually perfect up-to-date "Special Bibliography" and criticism of many of the books therein mentioned. It draws attention to an aggregate of almost five hundred volumes. One third of these are reviewed separately and in detail. The rest, though they have not been reviewed, have all been read and are all "cordially commended." "Taken together, these five hundred books present a bird's-eye view of the ways and means by which a newly-launched study has of late incontestably been developing into a science. The volumes selected for examination are restricted for the most part to publications which appeared between 1910 and 1914, although there are included also a few earlier and later volumes of admittedly outstanding importance."

Nor is it only from the standpoint of Comparative Religion as a science that the reviewer rejoices in Mr. Jordan's large achievement. He welcomes it yet more for its apologetic value. For Christian Apologetics may neither neglect nor ignore Comparative Religion. It is from the latter, and with weapons forged by the latter, that the most formidable attack on Christianity as the supernatural religion is now being made; and it is also out of arguments suggested and furnished by Comparative Religion that a new and singularly powerful defence of Christianity could be constructed. Indeed, if, as the reviewer holds, the standard "evidences" prove the Christian religion to be supernatural, the truly scientific comparison of it with the other faiths would establish it as being of all the religions of the world alone supernatural. Nor would the reviewer's estimate of the importance of the science of Comparative Religion to Christian Apologetics be lessened did he adopt the somewhat pragmatic conclusion of the author, "that the origin and formulated claims of a faith matter now very little, unless it can accomplish its high purpose more manifestly and more rapidly than its rivals. The great question of questions is: In how far does a given faith transform mankind with something purer, more unselfish, more divine?" We agree with the author when he says: "Comparative Religion has no higher function to fulfill than to supply an even fuller answer to this query, and then to make that answer known throughout the world." Nor do we believe, or suppose that Mr. Jordan believes, that there is any doubt as to the issue. Christianity needs only to be compared with the other religions to be manifested in its results as both "the truth" and "the desire of all nations."

On another ground, too, do we welcome anything that advances the study of Comparative religion. Such advance must throw more light on the foundations of all religion and so of the distinctively supernatural one. Unless man be the religious animal, the whole scheme of Christianity is undermined. But it is precisely when illuminated by the

torches of Comparative Religion and of its "adjuncts and allies" that we see most clearly, that "religion is a primitive, instinctive, and indestructable element in man;" that "this impulse invariably reveals itself;" and that it is "the most outstanding and influential fact in the whole range of human experience."

Beyond this point, however, reviewer and author must separate, as indeed, the latter implies is inevitable "It is beginning to be recognized," he says, "that Comparative Religion and Apologetics are studies which stand entirely apart from each other" (p. 517). Christian Apologetics beholds, and must behold, in Christ "God manifest in the flesh." Comparative Religion regards him, and, we are told, must regard him, as but one among many masters. The two positions are, of course, exclusive. But this is not all. Though with the certainty of being charged with lacking 'open-mindedness,' the reviewer must refuse to consent to the wisdom or the justice of classing and analyzing with the other religions, and as the other religions, that one which alone he believes to be, and to have been found to be, supernatural. Nor in saying this does he admit that he is either narrowminded or unscientific. Unless it be assumed that the distinction between the Supernatural and the natural can no longer be maintained, it must be recognized in order to any true comparison. That there may be such, one of the chief conditions is that essential differences in the things to be compared should first be noted and appreciated.

WILLIAM BRENTON GREENE, JR.

Princeton, N. J.

*Christian Science and the Bible.* By GEORGE N. LUCCOCK, D.D. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press. Pamphlet, pp. 48. 1915. Ten cents.

In view of the subtle means used by Mrs. Eddy to advance the teachings of Christian Science among adherents of orthodox churches, this booklet by Dr. Luccock is a very welcome as well as a very informing one.

In the pamphlet *No and Yes* Mrs. Eddy quotes an extract from a sermon by a Baptist clergyman, as containing sentiments which are "wholesome avowals of Christian Science." The same chapter contains this testimony, "a distinguished Doctor of Divinity said, 'Your book leavens my sermons.'" Professedly adhering to the Word of God, her chief work is, *Science and Health, with Key to the Scriptures*. Such statements have been misleading. Our author states in his introduction, "I have found that all of the many Christian Scientists with whom I have talked think they can hold to the Bible and follow Christian Science, and even say they would not accept Christian Science if its teachings contradicted the Bible or dishonored Jesus Christ."

This pamphlet contains a debate between Dr. Luccock and an official Christian Science Interpreter. First place is given to parts of a

sermon by Dr. Luccock printed in a newspaper, proving that a comparison of the Biblical teaching regarding prayer, God's view of children, person and work of Christ, resurrection of Christ, God and the fruits of religion, with that revealed by the Christian Science *Key to the Scriptures*, discloses, on closer examination, an identity in words only, not in real truth.

Although Mrs. Eddy declares "I enjoin it upon my students to hold no controversy or enmity over doctrines and traditions, or over the misconceptions of Christian Science, but to work, watch and pray for the amelioration of sin, sickness, and death," this sermon was replied to by a representative of the Christian Science Committee, when it was definitely pointed out how and where that teaching contradicts the Bible. Two replies to Dr. Luccock, in which Scripture is loosely quoted in places, and in which explanations from Mrs. Eddy's books are substituted for the teaching of the Bible, fail to answer his criticisms. The debate is closed by Dr. Luccock, since a third reply was not made, although invited.

Since the progress of Christian Science has been so remarkable, we hope this booklet will assist many to obtain a clear idea of the tenets of this cult. For the same reason, and also because many who are interested in this subject have neither time nor inclination to wade through much Christian Science literature, we wish that the answers of Dr. Luccock, as well as his quotations from *Science and Health*, had been fuller.

More explanation of how Mrs. Eddy treats the account of the creation in Genesis, teaching that the second chapter shows God as knowing error and that error can improve His creation, error being life and intelligence in matter, whereas the first chapter declares that God made all through mind and not through matter, will help us to understand Dr. Luccock when he says, "Mrs. Eddy says of a part of the Bible which contradicts her principle 'it must be a lie.'"

A reference to the real subordination of the Bible, and even of the power of God Himself to the power of the reading of *Science and Health*, as exhibited in the last hundred pages of Mrs. Eddy's book, where the statement "I purchased a copy of *Science and Health*, and simply from the reading of that grand book I was completely healed of all physical ailments in two weeks' time," and many others of similar import, are found, would enforce the statement of Dr. Luccock when he says, "people who are taking *Science and Health* under the impression that through it they are getting what God meant to teach in the Bible, have a clear call to sit up and take notice."

HENRY RANKIN.

Keller, Ga.

*Comparative Religion, Its Range and Limitations.* A Lecture by LOUIS HENRY JORDAN, B.D., Member of The Institut Ethnographique International, Paris. Author of 'Comparative Religion: Its

*Genesis and Growth,' 'Comparative Religion: Its Adjuncts and Allies' etc., etc.* Pamph., pp. 11. Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press: London, New York, Toronto, Melbourne and Bombay. The substance of this lecture has already appeared in the closing pages of "Comparative Religion: Its Adjuncts and Allies" (1915), first reviewed in this issue. It has been brought out in separate form because, in consequence of its timeliness and frankness, the author—and we think rightly—judges that it ought to be given the wider circulation that would be secured were it issued in handy form and at a trifling cost."

WILLIAM BRENTON GREENE, JR.

*Princeton, N. J.*

---

## EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY

*Atlas of the Historical Geography of the Holy Land.* Designed and edited by GEORGE ADAM SMITH, D.D., LL.D., LITT.D., Principal of the University of Aberdeen, Formerly Professor of Old Testament Language, Literature and Theology, United Free Church College, Glasgow; and prepared under the direction of J. G. BARTHOLOMEW, LL.D., F.R.S.E., F.R.G.S., Cartographer to the King, at the Edinburgh Geographical Institute. London: Hodder and Stoughton, Warwick Square, E.C. MCMXV. 14 $\frac{3}{4}$  by 9 $\frac{1}{2}$  inches. 25 shillings. American price \$7.50.

A splendid atlas of the Holy Land, of suitable size for library use. It contains sixty pages of maps and twenty-two pages of notes introductory to these maps; with chronological tables intended mainly for the period of one thousand years from the accession of David to the death of Herod. The maps illustrate not merely the topography of the country, but also the physical and economic conditions, and in a series of thirty keep pace with the historical geography of the Holy Land from the time before its conquest by the Israelites to the present day with its Christian missions.

Among the data in the "Chronological Tables" it is noticeable that the revolt of Mesha is dated "circa 860," during the reign of Ahab (see, however, 2 Kin. iii. 5); that the operations of Sennacherib in the west, which are recorded in Isa. xxxvi and xxxvii, are thought of as probably conducted during two campaigns, the first in 701 B.C. (Isa. xxxvi-xxxvii. 8) and the second in 691 B.C. (Isa. xxxvii. 9 ff.) which is listed as the year of Tirhaka's accession to the throne of Egypt (see this REVIEW, p. 330); and that the prophecy of Malachi is dated about 464 B.C., in accordance with recent opinion, and that of Joel about 410 (cp. *International Critical Commentary: Obadiah and Joel*, p. 61 bottom), and the book of Jonah perhaps 306 B.C. (cp. *ibid.*, *Jonah*, p. 13).

The sectional maps of the Holy Land are drawn from the maps of

the Survey on a scale of four miles to the inch; and they have the great convenience of covering more territory than the section requires, the border land appearing on more than one map and thus rendering measurements easy and making local direction visible at a glance. Almost all of the localities which figure in the identifications proposed by Major Conder and other members of the party of surveyors sent out by the Palestine Exploration Fund are marked on the maps; and properly so, greatly to the aid of students of Biblical geography, even when the suggested identification is rejected by the editor of the Atlas and only the modern name is given. Some very doubtful identifications are, however, accepted without question. Thus without query in either map or index, Baal-shalishah, Haruph, Ir-nahash, and Meronoth, although in each case Colonel Conder in his latest work, the articles prepared by him for *The Illustrated Bible Dictionary*, ventures only to say "perhaps"; and Mekonah and Madmannah, regarding which Colonel Conder uses the word "possibly," and of the latter declares that the suggested locality "does not appear to be a suitable site" (*Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible*); and Gederah of Judah and Jethlah, of which according to Colonel Conder himself "the site is doubtful." The basis of the identifications proposed by the Survey party is exhibited in an article in the current issue of this REVIEW, and further comment is accordingly unnecessary in this place upon their admittance to or exclusion from the maps of this admirable atlas. A hearty welcome to it.

JOHN D. DAVIS.

Princeton, N. J.

*The Archaeology of the Holy Land.* By P. S. P. HANDCOCK, M.A., Member of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law; Lecturer of the Palestine Exploration Fund; Formerly Assistant in the Department of Egyptian and Assyrian Antiquities, British Museum; Author of "Mesopotamian Archaeology," "Latest Light on Bible Lands," etc. With colored frontispiece, 25 plates, 109 figures in text, and 2 folding plans. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1916. 8vo, pp. 383. \$3.00.

The author has collected the archaeological data furnished by the excavations conducted in various parts of Palestine and published in reports and monographs and, where opinions differ regarding the nature and object of the things uncovered, has sifted the evidence and sought for the most probable theory. The material, as is well known, reveals much of the manner of life of the successive inhabitants of Palestine from the stone age far into the time of the Israelites. The information is of a general character; and the author finds that "on the whole, archaeology throws little new light on the religious practices and customs which obtained in Palestine during the Pre-Christian Semitic Periods" (p. 372). Naturally, therefore, few statements are made in the book regarding the religious practices and beliefs of the Israelites; and for some of the facts quite a different interpretation

from that which the author puts upon them is justified by his recognition that "soon after Joshua's death the Israelites forsook Yahveh in favour of Ba'al and Astarte (cf. *Judges ii, 13*)" (p. 365).

JOHN D. DAVIS.

Princeton, N. J.

*Bible Prophecies and the Plain Man.* With special reference to the present war. By Marr Murray. Hodder and Stoughton. London, New York, Toronto. 1915. 8vo, pp. xvi, 319, \$1.25.

According to the author "the British are the missing portion of the chosen people (p. 65)"; for "there is evidence . . . that the Goths, or Scythians or Sakai, as they were variously called, were the descendants of the ten tribes. After a time this people was driven towards the northwest. Some went to Scandinavia, others settled in western Europe. From there came the Saxons who captured England from the ancient Britons and settled in the land. The similarity between the words Sakai and Saxons is obvious" (p. 74). "The Northmen [Normans] were the descendants of the Benjaminites" (p. 75). "King George must belong to the house of David:" for "the genealogy of the royal house of Britain can be traced back through the kings of Ireland . . . to the year 580 B.C.," that is, to within seven years of the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar; and "legend has it that at that time King Heremon of Ireland married . . . the daughter of Zedekiah, the last king of Judah" (p. 75 f.). It is suggested that the United States are the tribe of Manasseh (p. 83 ff), and that the Germans are the Assyrians (p. 87 ff). The Antichrist will be an individual, who "will become the most relentless persecutor of religion that the world has ever known." From the prophecy of Daniel, "it is clear that he will arise somewhere in the Near East," not in Syria or Egypt, but "somewhere in Greece or in the countries around Constantinople," in one of the Balkan States quite likely (p. 280-282). Everything is prepared for the building of a literal, restored city of Babylon on the Euphrates to be his capital (p. 269, 273); and "it would not be surprising if Judas, [raised from the dead], were to be the False Prophet [and 'trusty lieutenant'] of the Antichrist" (p. 283). From this point of view prophecy is seen to have "special reference to the present war," and in many instances to reveal the manner, time, and place of events in the great, continuing conflict between the church and the world, and to point out the particular nations and persons who will be engaged in the struggle until it ends in the final consummation of the kingdom.

JOHN D. DAVIS.

Princeton, N. J.

*The End of the European War in the light of Scripture.* By F. C. JENNINGS. Price, ten cents. New York: Charles C. Cook, 150 Nassau Street. [1915.] Pp. 40.

"We say then with absolute confidence that we are in the fourth,

'the last watch of the night.' We know in which watch our Lord will come, for there is no other in which he could come" (p. 6); and we are "not only in the last fourth, but in the last seventh division of the Church's path," as outlined in Rev. ii. and iii. (p. 7). The inevitable deduction from prophecy is that "a compromise will probably end the war" (p. 19). What "extraordinary event, possibly some divine interposition, may by the very terror and wonder it would excite, lead to that compromise?" The second coming of Christ.

JOHN D. DAVIS.

*Princeton, N. J.*

*The Law of Human Life. The Scriptures in the Light of the Science of Psychology.* By ELIJAH V. BROOKSHIRE. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York and London: The Knickerbocker Press. 1916. 8vo: pp. xliv, 471. \$2.50 net.

History was recorded by the writers of the Scriptures, not for its own sake, but for its religious teaching. Parable also was spoken, not for its own sake as literature, but for a religious purpose. In a word, "whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that through patience and through comfort of the scriptures we might have hope." The author evidently accepts this doctrine of the apostle as true. He is, however, indifferent to the actual occurrence of the events. One and all they may be history or fable. Everything is interpreted as allegory, or as the author prefers to say psychologically. The book is characterized by moral earnestness; but in our judgment readers will find the treatment fanciful in the extreme and the interpretation put upon the words of Jesus and Paul usually forced and strained indeed.

JOHN D. DAVIS.

*Princeton, N. J.*

*Tekst en Uitleg. Practische Verklaring van het Nieuwe Testament door Prof. Dr. A. van Veldhuizen met medewerking von Prof. Dr. J. A. C. van Leeuwen, Prof. Dr. J. W. Pont, Prof. Dr. J. de Zwaan e. a.*

*Het Evangelie van Markus* door Dr. A. van Veldhuizen, Hoogleeraar vanwege de Ned. Herv. Kerk aan de Ryks Universiteit te Groningen. 1914. pp. 143.

*Het Evangelie van Mattheus* door Dr. J. A. C. van Leeuwen, Hoogleeraar aan de Ryks-Universiteit te Utrecht. 1915. Pp. 172. Te Groningen by J. B. Wolter's U. M.

We here receive two little volumes in a proposed series of popular, practical expositions of the books of the New Testament. Part of the collaborators are also engaged in preparing a new Dutch translation of the Scriptures. In that, however, not individual opinions but a consensus and compromise of collective scholarship will find expression, and a long period is required for its precipitation. In order not to keep

the public waiting till then, in the present series the individual writers are offered free scope for submitting their favorite personal views and conclusions. The processes by which these have been reached are to be entirely kept from the reader. Only results will be presented, and these in the most untechnical form without the introduction of Greek words or theological terminology. Whether the entire absence of the last-named element will contribute to the popularity of the series may seem doubtful, for the Dutch are still on the whole a theologically-inclined people and hardly ever study the Scriptures without reflection upon doctrinal issues.

The plan of the separate volumes is uniform, each consisting of an introduction, the translation, based on Nestle's Greek text, and a brief running commentary. From the nature of the case the last occupies most of the space. A possible more scientific impulse on the part of some readers is met by a select bibliography at the close of the introductory section.

The attitude of the authors both in isagogical and in theological questions is a moderately conservative one. That the Evangelists made mistakes is conceded. Mark in his one quotation Chap. i, 2 made one, and another in connection with Abiathar, ii. 26. The tradition about Mark as the author is accepted and the date is placed about 70. Matthew also is from the Apostle whose name it bears, in preference to the view that the name Matthew was attached originally to the *Logia* and only passed over from that source to the First Gospel. Our Greek text of Matthew is the translation of an Aramaic original. The two-document hypothesis, specifically the dependence of Matthew on Mark or on an Ur-Markus, is not favored. Dr. van Leeuwen regards Matthew as older (in its Aramaic form) than Mark and assumes that Mark made use if it in writing his Gospel. As a tentative date for the Aramaic Matthew the period from 50-60 is named.

The expository comments are on the whole in keeping with the purpose of the work to give instruction of a popular kind. Here and there the resolve to exclude all reference to scientific processes and debates has interfered with the intelligibleness of the statements. It is exceedingly doubtful whether from the casual references to Wrede's "Messianic secrecy" the average reader will be able to form any clear view of Wrede's hypothesis, and yet without such a view, the introduction of this critic's name is wholly useless. Apt to mislead is the statement on p. 28 of the introduction to Mark that "even Wrede brings out the metaphysical and divine aspect of Jesus in Mark." That Wrede brings this out is not out of keeping but wholly in line with his theory.

GEERHARDUS VOS.

Princeton, N. J.

*Israel en de Baäls Afval of Ontwikkeling.* Rede gehouden by de overdracht van het Rectoraat der Theologische School van de Gereform-

eerde Kerken in Nederland, den 7 en December 1915 door Dr. J. Ridderbos. Nyverdal 1915, E. J. Bosch Jbzn. pp. 95.

In this rectoral address the author subjects the well-known views of the Graf-Wellhausen school concerning the influence of the Canaanitish Baal-cult upon the religion of Israel to a thorough-going critique. The Old Testament does not deny this influence but regards it as apostasy; the evolutionary critics look upon it as a necessary and on the whole beneficial transition stage in the development which led from the pre-Mosaic and the Mosaic religion to the higher faith of the prophets.

The primitive religion of Israel was of the nomadic type, monotonous, austere, the religion of the steppe; it was only through contact with the agricultural religion of the Canaanites, that it could lay aside these unprogressive features and acquire the potentialities of a "Kultur" religion.

Thus not merely accidentals or externals in the line of cult-observance are supposed to have come to Israel from this pagan source, but to a considerable extent the inner propelling force in the marvellous flight of Israel's religious genius was due to the same influence. Of late Baudissin has even attempted to derive the conception of Jehovah as "the living God" and its correlate, the idea of the resurrection, from the religion of the Canaanites.

In criticizing this hypothesis Dr. Ridderbos makes skillful use of the new light which modern discoveries and explorations have shed on the ancient cultural and religious conditions of the Orient. We are often being told that the results of this new research are unfavorable or even fatal to the Wellhausenian views. Unfortunately no adequate effort seems to have been made to point this out in the concrete. The great value of Dr. Ridderbos' work consists in its clear showing of how the historically ascertained facts run athwart the hypothetical construction in such a way that the latter becomes implausible or even impossible not merely in certain details, but in its large fundamental fabric. The ease with which Israel after its settlement in Canaan is assumed to have assimilated itself to the Baal-religion, either by way of syncretism or through modification of the Jahve-religion, and that without any disturbing consciousness of infidelity to its ancestral traditions, is by the critics largely explained from the fact that the Canaanitish religion at the time existed still largely in the stage of polydemonism, its conception of the deity being that of the lower, undefined kind which lacks the pronounced personal element. The Baals were numina associated with various places, the Baal as a single God is a product of later mythological abstraction. Only because such a character attached to the Canaanitish Baalim could the Israelites imagine that their recognition was not inconsistent with the claim of Jahve upon the service of his people, the more so since the Israelites themselves had far from outgrown the polydemonistic beliefs of their own past. Dr. Ridderbos carefully shows how unwarranted this polydemonistic

interpretation of the Baal-religion appears in the light of the newly-ascertained facts. Of course there was polydemonistic superstition among the Canaanites as there was among Israel, but it merely coexisted with the other more personal type of religion, and cannot be proven to have been the source out of which the latter was developed, as even Baudissin acknowledges. The stage of culture reached by the Canaanites was far too high to permit of identifying their religion with polydemonism. Baal was not exclusively associated with the soil. The association with heaven was quite ancient, since even in Elijah's time the priests of the Tyrian Baal expect their God to send fire from heaven. And if the location of Baal in heaven is ancient, then the unified conception also cannot be entirely a later product. The author is inclined to take the opposite view, viz. to consider the plural localized. Baals developed out of the one Baal. With the falling away of this misconception of the character of the religion of Canaan, the favorite view that Israel could have naïvely, innocently, almost unconsciously drifted into the worship of Baal is much weakened. Still more it is weakened by considering what the actual character of the Baal-religion was. It had few ethical elements, its two outstanding practices were that of human sacrifice and of sexual impurity, both confirmed anew by the modern excavations. It is quite incredible that Israel should without qualms of conscience have abandoned itself to a cult of this character.

If thus the Canaanitish factor in the construction appears with the new knowledge we have of it to be far different from the picture given of it by the critics, the same must be said of the religion which Israel carried into Canaan. The pre-Mosaic religion was not polydemonism. Nor was it purely nomadic. After a critique of the well-known assertions to that effect, the author presents some positive counter-considerations. In this he relies largely upon the testimony of the prophets, who condemn as apostasy what the critics regard as ancient legitimate inheritance. Of course Dr. Ridderbos is well aware that the prophets afford a common debating ground between us and the critics only so long as their testimony is restricted to contemporary conditions. In their interpretation of the past religious history of Israel they are not trusted any more by the modern school than the historical writers of the Old Testament. But some of the critics themselves seem to feel that this wholesale discrediting of the judgment and testimony of men in other respects so highly idealized in their own theory as the prophets are, is far from justified. Some, like Marti, make perceptible endeavors to gloss over or tone down the contradiction between the prophetic and the critical renderings of the past. In regard to the future these same prophets, whose views of former history are cast aside as perverted and misleading, are credited with the highest degree of "genial intuition." There surely is an inconsistency in this. Pertinent also is the consideration, that if the whole prophetic prediction of the judgment was based on a misapprehension of the culpable character of the past

and present, then the divine government which has brought on the judgment in harmony with the word of the prophets would seem to be involved in this stupendous misreading of the actual development taken by the history of Israel.

In conclusion the author points out the true causes which will explain Israel's proclivity towards the religion of Canaan. These lie in the ancient paganistic taint of which the people had not fully rid themselves, in the intermingling with the Canaanites through commercium and connubium which, in spite of the divine warning, the Israelites allowed themselves, in the seductive sensual character of the Baal-cult, in the inferiority of the Israelites, as compared with Canaan, in the matter of culture, in the culpable conduct of the priests. But all these factors, even so far as they are not distinctively moral, cannot alter the fact that Israel's yielding to them was a sinful process, which contributed to the development of the true religion of the Old Testament not in any positive way, but merely negatively by creating room for the display of the divine procedure of redemption. That the settlement in the holy land had its positive contribution to make towards the working out of God's plan of revelation is not denied. Only so far as this was the case it was not the Baal-religion, but the Canaanitish environment, as a milieu of common grace which should receive the credit.

If we were to make any criticism on the author's argument it would be in regard to two points. In the first place it should have been brought out with greater precision at the outset, that the critical theory itself, at least in some of its forms, leaves room for a measure of apostasy in Israel's assimilation to the Baal-religion. Some of the critics treat this as a real decline from the austere, nomadic religion of the earlier period. Only this primitive religion from which the Israelites fell away was by no means identical with the prophetic religion, with falling away from which they were afterwards according to the critics unjustly charged by the prophets. The point at issue, therefore, sharply defined, is not whether there was apostasy, but whether the apostasy was from a revealed norm identical with the prophetic preaching. Our second point is that the distinction between the subjective and the objective aspect of the apostasy involved might have been more clearly drawn. Over against the critical assertion of the wholly naïve character of the popular state of mind the former is important; over against the asserted benefit accruing to the Old Testament religion from its marriage to the Baal-cult the latter is of equal weight. A somewhat more formal and pointed distinction between those two sides of the question would perhaps have been helpful to the mind of the average reader.

GEERHARDUS VOS.

*Princeton, N. J.*

## HISTORICAL THEOLOGY

*Deliverance: The Freeing of the Spirit in the Ancient World.* By HENRY OSBORN TAYLOR, Litt.D. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1915. 12mo, pp. VII, 294. \$1.25 net.

To most readers familiar with Dr. Taylor's works, especially his two volumes on *The Mediaeval Mind*—that most admirable history of the development of thought and emotion in the Middle Ages—, the book before us will quite likely prove somewhat disappointing. To be sure, it frequently and at times even impressively reveals the same penetration of insight, breadth of sympathy, balance of judgment and charm of poetic treatment that mark all the author's studies in history and philosophy. But some of the chapters are quite too brief and superficial to have much value, while others, in spite of their ample proportions, are too vague to be satisfactory. Indeed, it requires more energy of thought than most readers will care to expend in order to ascertain just what the writer's purpose may have been in stringing together what he has called "these 'night thoughts.'" According to his own account he has here attempted "some ordering and statement of the ways in which our spiritual ancestors of all times and countries adjusted themselves to the fears and hopes of their natures, thus reaching a freedom of action in which they accomplished their lives, or it may be they did but find peace; yet brought it forth from such depth of conviction that their peace became peace for thousands and for millions. . . . I would set forth rather in themselves, and simply, those individuals who most clearly illustrate phases of human adjustment with life, its limitations, aspirations, and conceived determining powers, working within or from without."

With so general a proposition as his only guide, it is not strange that the author practically discards in the text the terms "Deliverance" and "Freeing," used in the title, and sticks by preference to the altogether hazy conception of mere "adjustment"; with "love of the best" coming in at the conclusion (p. 278) as a sufficiently "universal element" to account for about everything that may need explanation in the whole vast field of the religious life of the ancients. The consequence is that few readers will be inclined to regard the three chapters on Jesus, Paul, and Augustine, as containing anything like an adequate treatment of distinctively Christian teaching on redemption conceived as salvation from sin, or the chapters on "China: Duty and Detachment" and on "The Indian Annihilation of Individuality" as having enough in common with the principles of revealed religion to make it seem natural or desirable to coordinate such "adjustments" with the views (chapter V) of "The Prophets of Israel."

Doubtless, however, we are in danger of doing the author an injustice, if we take his work seriously as a systematic treatise on ancient religions. We ought rather to regard it—and this we are quite willing to do—as a somewhat heterogeneous collection of interesting and withal

stimulating "night thoughts" on selected phases of some of the ancient religions.

FREDERICK W. LOETSCHER

Princeton, N. J.

*The Blackest Page of Modern History: Events in Armenia in 1915: The Facts and the Responsibilities.* By HERBERT ADAMS GIBBONS, Ph.D., author of "The Foundation of the Ottoman Empire," "The New Map of Europe," etc. G. P. Putman's Sons, 1916. 12mo, pp. 71. 75 cents.

Dr. Gibbons has had unusual opportunities for acquainting himself with the facts regarding the treatment of the Armenians by the Ottoman Government, and his account of the massacre of 1915, in which almost a million of these subjects of the Empire were killed, is no doubt a trustworthy statement of the appalling and hideous facts. And it is well that the large public to whose confidence the author has so highly commended himself by his excellent books and articles on the war should know the truth, sickeningly repulsive though it be, touching the fate of this unfortunate race.

But when Dr. Gibbons abandons the rôle of narrator for that of judge he enters upon an exceedingly difficult task, and we cannot but feel that some of his statements have so little connection with "the facts," that many readers will be unable to concur with him in his fixing of "the responsibilities." Can any open and fair mind accept the logic of the following sentences (pp. 59 f., 62) as final?—"Since Germany refused to intervene before the extermination of the Armenians started, is she not accessory before the fact to the murder by sword, by starvation and thirst, by exposure, by beating, by rape, of nearly a million human beings, whose fault was that they were 'in the way,' and whose vulnerability and defencelessness lay in the sole fact that they were Christians? Since Germany has persisted in refusing to intervene during the process of extermination, is she not *particeps criminis?*" . . . "That they kept quiet, and refused to act, when they alone could have saved the Armenians from destruction, is the first count in the case against the Germans. It is serious. The second is sinister. When we try to find the purpose behind the Armenian massacres, we are confronted with what is, under the circumstances, an eloquent accusation against the German Government and the German people. *The Germans, and the Germans alone, will benefit by the extermination of the Armenians*" (the italics are the author's). With about as much propriety one may hold Great Britain and France, or the British and French people, responsible for the shocking atrocities inflicted by Russian armies upon the civil population of East Prussia.

"The Blackest Page of Modern History" presents many difficulties to the candid inquirer. That the author's summary shifting of the blame upon Germany is, to say the least, not the only possibility in the case, is clear in the light of the confession he has felt himself con-

strained to make (p. 47 f.): "The trans-Caucasian policy of Russia, and the Balkan policy of all the Great Powers first awakened, and has since been the exciting cause of, the fanaticism of the Moslems of Turkey against the Armenians. Before there was an acute 'Question of the Orient,' did we ever have great Armenian massacres? And yet, Christian Europe never made a concerted effort to save this unhappy race from the results of Europe's own dealings with the Turks."

FREDERICK W. LOETSCHER.

Princeton, N. J.

*John Wesley's Place in History.* By WOODROW WILSON, President of the United States. New York. The Abingdon Press. 12mo, pp. 48; 50 cents net.

This is an address delivered by President Wilson at Wesleyan University on the occasion of the Wesley Bicentennial.

It is a noble discourse worthy alike of the theme, the occasion, and the distinguished speaker. Wesley's character is clearly and distinctly portrayed and his life and work skilfully interpreted in the light of the outstanding features of the eighteenth century. The historian, the literateur, and "the preacher" in the President reveal themselves in happy combination in these pages. We may transcribe a few sentences as being characteristic of the author's style of treatment and of his judgment concerning Wesley: "Unquestionably this man altered and in his day governed the spiritual history of England and the English-speaking race on both sides of the sea." "The church was dead and Wesley awakened it; the poor were neglected and Wesley sought them out; the gospel was shrunken into formulas and Wesley flung it fresh upon the air once more in the speech of common men; the air was stagnant and fetid; he cleared and purified it by speaking always and everywhere the word of God; and men's spirits responded, leaped at the message, and were made wholesome as they comprehended it." "No doubt he played no small part in saving England from the madness which fell upon France ere the century ended."

And having ventured to quote so much we cannot forbear adding an excerpt from the closing paragraph: the familiar truth is none the truer because of the eminence of the station occupied by the speaker; but such words are ever timely, and the message of the President may inspire some minister of the gospel to cultivate a more intimate and helpful acquaintance with the great religious leader of the eighteenth century and to see his own duty and high privilege in a new and more favorable light: "John Wesley's place in history is the place of the evangelist who is also a master of affairs. The evangelization of the world will always be the road to fame and power, but only to those who take it seeking, not these things, but the kingdom of God; and if the evangelist be what John Wesley was, a man poised in spirit, deeply conversant with the natures of his fellow-men, studious of the truth, sober to think, prompt and yet not rash to act, apt to speak

without excitement and yet with a keen power of conviction, he can do for another age what John Wesley did for the eighteenth century."

FREDERICK W. LOETSCHER.

Princeton, N. J.

*The Church of England and Episcopacy.* By A. J. MASON, D.D., Honorary Fellow of Pembroke and Jesus Colleges, and formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, Canon of Canterbury. Cambridge; at the University Press, 1914. 8vo, pp. X, 560. \$2.50.

The position of unstable equilibrium which the Anglican Establishment has ever maintained midway between the Roman Catholic and the Reformed Churches has naturally called forth a vast apologetic and polemic literature on the subject of the origin, validity, and obligation of "the historic episcopate." Ever and anon, in the maintenance of the arduous conflict on the two fronts at one and the same time, the artillery becomes conspicuously more active, and one wonders what the relative gains and losses will amount to. Such an occasion was that out of which the volume before us has grown—the famous conference at Kikuyu.

No doubt the author's gun is one of rather impressive dimensions. His real purpose, we ought to remind ourselves at the outset, however, is not that of attempting a task which never yet has been satisfactorily accomplished and which apparently—most Christians being the judges—never can be, that of proving that the theory of the apostolic succession is borne out by the facts pertaining to the Anglican communion. Rather has he contented himself with the humbler purpose of "putting together a kind of catena of passages from Anglican writers, from the Reformation to the Catholic Revival of the nineteenth century," to show that these leaders all consistently in the main, though with divergencies as to details, championed this theory. The author naturally takes "high ground" himself. He is convinced that "to tamper with episcopacy would be to throw away all that is most distinctive in the character and prospects of the Church of England." For him episcopacy is an "apostolic and divine institution." At the same time he is most gracious, not to say condescending, in permitting many of his authorities to express "their wish to make out the best possible case for those who had a different polity, while aiming in the main at promoting a scriptural and spiritual Christianity" (!).

The chief value of the book, then, lies in the imposing array of citations that make up its bulk. These passages vary greatly in the cogency of their arguments, in the quality of their appeal. But taken as a whole they give one a thorough insight into the claims of historic Anglicanism. Certainly few readers will fail to endorse the author's judgment that "no one who follows the evidence can doubt that the church of England stands for episcopacy with a resolution peculiarly its own." Specially interesting, too, are the appendices, in which the author undertakes to prove that the Reformed Church of England has never

admitted into her ministry men not episcopally ordained; discusses the "plea of necessity" raised by the continental Reformed churches in behalf of non-episcopal ordinations; and considers such cognate topics as ordination among the non-conformists of England, and the perennial question of ecclesiastical schism.

On the whole, however, one cannot escape the impression that the foundation upon which these authorities seek to build their structure needs itself to be reinforced; that the theory of the tactual transmission of a special grace from the apostles to their episcopal successors is still in need of adequate proof; that somehow primitive Christianity must have been a religion of greater spiritual freedom and power than this doctrine of the Anglican controversialists would lead one to suppose. After all, too, the prime question for those of us who still use a capital "P" when we call ourselves Protestants is not, what do the Anglicans think of themselves? but, what do both Roman Catholics and Protestants think of the Anglicans and their "orders"?

FREDERICK W. LOETSCHER.

Princeton, N. J.

*The Hale Lectures 1913-4. Biographical Studies in Scottish Church History.* By Anthony Mitchell, D.D., Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney. Delivered in St. Paul's Church, Chicago, Illinois, May 7 to 14, 1914. Milwaukee: The Young Churchman Company. 1914. 12mo, pp. VI, 302.

These "Biographical Studies," seven in number, give the author occasion to pass in review the salient events in Scottish Church History from the sixth to the twentieth centuries. The sketches are presented in graphic and entertaining style; the pages are adorned with a number of excellent illustrations; and abundant references to the sources and to the secondary literature are given in the footnotes.

The series opens with an account of Columba and his associates in missionary service at Iona. The transition from the Celtic to the Roman Catholic traditions is connected with the name of the saintly Queen Margaret (1068-1093). Dr. Mitchell expresses the conviction that a certain book containing the liturgical gospels, a beautifully illuminated manuscript known to belong to the eleventh century and purchased by the Bodleian Library in 1887 and now preserved there as one of its chief treasures, is probably the very book that once belonged to Margaret but which through the carelessness of a bearer while he was crossing the ford of a river was dropped into the stream to be recovered, practically unharmed, after it had lain "a long time" in its watery grave. Lanfranc's letter to the Queen—the document is translated in an appendix—shows her willingness and determination to bring southern influences to bear upon the Scottish Church. One of the most interesting chapters is that on William Elphinstone (1431-1514), Rector of the University of Glasgow, Bishop of Ross, later of Aberdeen, the chief founder of the University of Aberdeen. Himself born

out of wedlock—his father being a priest—he gave his life to the cause of church reform and higher education.

The author's chief interest, from the time of the Reformation, centers in the varying fortunes of episcopacy in Scotland. John Erskine of Dun, significantly enough, is chosen as the representative of the sixteenth century in preference to John Knox. Of course, the two leaders often figured in the same scenes, and the portrait of the less well known reformer is an admirable companion piece to the more familiar picture of the chief hero. Dr. Mitchell is by no means unfair to Knox, but, in common with recent critics of Knox's *History of the Reformation*, he seeks to prove that this celebrated source needs to be used with caution so far as some of its details are concerned.

The last three sketches cover, respectively, the covenanting period, the days of the penal laws, and the most recent times. The representatives are Robert Leighton, once a Presbyterian, who, having accepted "reordination," rose to be archbishop of Glasgow; John Skinner, as good a Presbyterian in his youth as he was celebrated later as a poet, chosen bishop of Aberdeen in 1782 and as such taking part in the consecration of Samuel Seabury as the first "Bishop of Connecticut;" and John Dowden, the Irish scholar who until a few years ago graced the episcopate of Edinburgh, and was largely instrumental in bringing the Scottish Episcopal Church into closer relationship with the Church of England, after Skinner had succeeded in rehabilitating episcopacy after its age-long see-saw with Scotch Presbyterianism. On the whole Dr. Mitchell treats this period of conflict with judicial fairness, finding much to praise and to blame on both sides.

FREDERICK W. LOETSCHER.

Princeton, N. J.

*The Reformation. Being an Outline of the History of the Church from A.D. 1503 to A.D. 1648.* By THE REV. JAMES POUNDER WHITNEY, B.D. Chaplain of S. Edward's, Cambridge. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1907. Pages VIII. 501. In "The Church Universal" Series.

This history of the Reformation is written unmistakably from the (high?) Anglican point of view. Great attention is given to the Papacy and the Lateran Council (Ch. 2), the Council of Trent (Chps. 7-9), Monastic Reform and the Jesuits (Chps. 10 and 13), the Greek Church (Ch. 14), and the Papacy subsequent to the Tridentine Council (Ch. 15). But this perspective does not become a "fault" as the reader proceeds. One may write of the Reformation in many ways. Mr. Whitney tries to see it as a Protestant who is confessedly out of sympathy with the extremes of Puritanism and Non-Conformity, yet also unsympathetic with the immoral formalism of the Church of the Sixteenth century. His view of the Reformers is naturally "moderated" by this personal equation, and if he sins here at all, it is more by voluntary omission than by positive assertion. No one will, for instance, quarrel

with him for calling Calvin, in view of the Genevan's wonderful influence, "a sort of Protestant Pope" (p. 101), but he scarcely does full justice to Luther in omitting to show, although he adds a special note on the subject (pp. 464-469), that Luther's doctrine of justification by faith alone was actually un-Pauline: a task to which Mr. Whitney is quite welcome! Zwingli is properly called "the revolutionary theologian of the Reformation" (p. 66), but we should certainly demand more proof than the author gives for the unqualified statement (p. 77) that Zwingli was "a rationalist in his conceptions."

In the final summing up (pp. 452-455) considerable blame is laid on the popes for failing to use aright a strategic and inevitable crisis within the Church. They neglected to measure up to a world that was growing new. Mr. Whitney here voices the general Anglican lament of a break which, with saner direction, might have been avoided. On the whole, this study of the Reformation is too reflective and analytical ever to become a class text-book, but it is entirely worthwhile for the specific approach which it makes to this great movement. A short bibliography and a good index, together with the note on Justification, complete the book.

BENJAMIN F. PAIST, JR.

*Langhorne, Penna.*

*The Story of the Christian Centuries.* By EDWARD GRIFFIN SELDEN, D.D.  
Pastor of the Madison Avenue Reformed Church, Albany, N. Y.  
Fleming H. Revell Co. New York. 1901. Pages 319.

Every now and then one meets with readers who, impatient of historical detail, and unwilling to follow the numerous and delicate threads of development in the slow processes of the ages, nevertheless do have a real desire to know something of the general scope of Christian history. They will not burrow through lengthy accounts of old controversies of which, in the proud pragmatism of their heart, they do not see the point. They are the kind who have forsaken the good old classics under the stress of the modern short-story craze, and they do not read a chapter through if they have the least suspicion that it may be too long. They have a horror of anything that looks as if it might be "dry." They are easily wearied. Perfectly good people, who ought to know more than they do of specialized themes. Not only they, but there are times when we all like to have matters summed up for us, generalized into a connected whole which the mind can grasp without being bewildered and baffled by unmanageable details.

Such a need Dr. Selden has recognized in his "Story of the Christian Centuries." Knowing how strong is the sense of sequence in most persons, he everywhere seeks to fill in the usual gaps. The best thing we can say is that this story is consistently connective. It places before the reader a synoptical view of the chief persons, events, controversies, and institutions from the death of Jesus down to the close of the nineteenth century. There are some very good summaries; e.g., of

Gnosticism and Ebionism (pp. 48-51), of Constantine (pp. 70-72), and of Puritanism (pp. 232-237, 262-267), which he calls "the reformation of the Reformation;" and the unflinching perseverance of the English Puritans is well noted in the observation that "it was no holiday affair to live Christianity on any day from Edward VI. to James II." (p. 266). Looking for omissions or flaws, we might say that a little more should have been observed of the French Revolution (cf. p. 296); that while Dr. Selden is careful to set down the more important dates, that of the famous Council of Chalcedon in 451 might better have been given (p. 78); that, finally, there will doubtless be those who will not lay so much at Augustine's door (p. 89).

BENJAMIN F. PAIST, JR.

*Langhorne, Penna.*

---

## SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY

*What is a Christian? A Book for the Times.* By JOHN WALKER POWELL, Author of "The Poets' Vision of Man," "The Silences of the Master," "Him that Overcometh." New York: The Macmillan Company. 1915. 12mo. pp. xxix, 201. Index.

It is not altogether easy to determine how to approach a book like Mr. Powell's. It makes no pretension to be a contribution to knowledge. It certainly is not a contribution to thought. Mr. Powell himself calls it "a book for the times." Probably he would not object to having it spoken of as an interpretation; an interpretation of Christianity to the times; that is to say, an attempt to express Christianity in terms of "the better knowledge and thought of the day." Mr. Powell is not the first to make such an attempt. There were some a long while ago who considered the Gospel as it had been accustomed to be preached quite unacceptable to enlightened minds, and who sought to reëxpress it in "wisdom of words." Paul thought that they made void the cross of Christ; and the cross of Christ was to him in an important sense the essence of Christianity. He seems to have had an idea that a good deal that passed for up-to-date knowledge in the world was knowledge falsely so called; and that one might do well to take heed to its purveyors lest haply he might be made a spoil of through what Paul calls their philosophy and (the "and" is doubtless epexegetical) vain deceit. There appears to be some danger that those who would interpret Christianity "for the times" may end by not so much getting Christianity into the times as getting the times into Christianity. It can scarcely be said that those who have essayed this task in our own day (their name is legion) have wholly escaped this danger. We fear that it can hardly be said that Mr. Powell has escaped it. We fear that those who heard his sermons when they were preached, and

those who will read them, now that they are cast into book-form, will have learned, and will learn, from them more of the times than of Christianity.

The question which Mr. Powell posits for himself is, What is a Christian? He appears to suppose (p. xxi) that this is equivalent to asking, "What is the common denominator of the Christian centuries, of theological parties and religious sects." But what is common to the Christian centuries, to theological parties and religious sects is not Christianity, but at best the higher heathenism—unless we are prepared to maintain that all the Christian centuries, all theological parties and all religious sects have been and are purely Christian. Even in the Apostolic age Christianity could not have been arrived at by taking the common denominator of all the theological parties and religious sects which claimed the Christian name. Paul at least would have us understand that Christianity was exclusively what he taught; not what was common to what he taught and what was taught by the Corinthian *illuminati*, the Colossian Gnosticisms, and those men "corrupted in mind and bereft of the truth" who, he tells us, were troubling the church at Ephesus. Mr. Powell does not, it is true, care very much what Paul would have us understand: he repudiates all external authority whether in religion or in morals. But in that he merely betrays that his standpoint is not Christian. For has not a prophet of our own day (there are credentials for you!) told us that the rejection of all external authority is the very characteristic of heathenism?

"The 'eathen in 'is blindness bows down to wood and stone,  
'E don't obey no orders unless they is 'is own."

Certain it is meanwhile that what is common to all who have claimed the name of Christian through all the centuries, and to all the parties and sects who claim it now, is nothing but natural religion. And he who will seek his "Christianity" in this "common denominator" can find it only in the natural religion which is all that Christianity has in common with other faiths, whether these other faiths masquerade under the name of Christianity or some less misleading designation.

It surely would be difficult to give a purer expression to sheer naturalism than is done when it is said that "mankind is incurably religious"—in itself a striking expression of an important truth—and that what the religion of the Old Covenant is, is "this religious impulse reaching its highest development, and expressing itself in the purest form," while "Jesus Christ, coming in the midst of the religious life of Judaism, simply"—simply!—"purified and vivified the religious ideals of his race and raised the religious emotions of his followers to the height of a spiritual passion which became a life-giving, fructifying influence in the world, having power to reproduce itself in the lives of others with whom the first disciples came in contact." That is what Mr. Powell understands Christianity to be—a simplified Judaism touched with emotion (this is also the conception of Christianity

which Julius Wellhausen and Wilhelm Bousser proclaim), that Judaism being only highly developed heathenism. And Christianity itself being this, "Christian theology is nothing in the world but"—nothing in the world but, mind you,—"an attempt to rationalize that experience, to explain and interpret it." What experience? The experience of the inherent religious impulse of man, reaching its highest development and expressing itself in the purest form, become a spiritual passion. Christianity, thus, as a theology, is only the highest and best of the natural religions. There is nothing super-natural in it. Nay, we did not so much as hear whether there is a Holy Spirit. What makes Christians blood-brothers is not the common experience of redemption in the blood of Christ and of communion with Him through the Spirit, that has been, on the ground of that redemption, given to them (that is what the founders of Christianity taught about it: but they have no weight with Mr. Powell) but "a common devotion to their Master, and their common experience of heightened religious feeling and quickened ethical purpose which grow out of it" (pp. 117, 118).

With this conception of what Christianity is underlying it, we know what to expect in Mr. Powell's exposition of *What is a Christian?* He is willing to admit that a Christian has a faith and an ethics, the faith and the ethics implicated in his religious point of view. In drawing out the implications, in faith and morals, of the "Christian's" religious point of view he goes the ordinary way of the "liberal" teacher of religious proclivities. He seems to imagine that, in doing so, he has not departed widely from what is ordinarily held to be Christian doctrine and practice. "If a few things which by some are regarded as essential have been set aside or inadequately stressed," he says (p. 171), "it will doubtless be admitted that the matters herein set forth constitute the main factors of essential Christianity; and that any man whose life displays the influence of these ideals and convictions is entitled to be regarded as Christian." We cannot admit, however, that faith, however vivid, in the Fatherhood of God, the Brotherhood of Man, the Mastership of Jesus Christ, and the possibility of Future Bliss will make a man a Christian. All the Christianity of Christianity is here left out. And if this is the only Christianity which can hope to be "in any sense the ultimate religious faith" of men, then the ultimate faith of men will not be in any distinctive sense Christian. As Jesus Christ is envisaged by Mr. Powell chiefly as the ethical Master of Mankind, it is natural that his chief interest should lie in the ethical implicates of what he regards as Christianity, and to these he gives the largest place in his expositions. The circumstances of the day lead him, indeed, to give especial attention to the two topics of "the Christian and War" and "the Christian and Wealth." On both these topics his attitude is, in the main, sane, and on each of them he says some wise things. But even here where Mr. Powell is at his best, there are some things left to be desired.

We may be permitted to ask, with our eye on a broader field of assertion than Mr. Powell's book, what it can mean to say that Christianity means the abolition of war and even the abolition of poverty. That Jesus tells us that we have the poor always with us, and warns us to expect wars and rumors of war, may seem unimportant to thinkers of this class; for what does it matter to them what Jesus thought and said? But it does seem remarkable that thoughtful men should deal so lightly with so obvious a fact as sin. Of course neither poverty nor war will ever be abolished until sin is first abolished. The trouble with current economic theory is that it never reckons with sin: the trouble with our pacifists is that they are hot to set up the millennium in a sinful world. It is silly to talk of a world "thoroughly Christianized" except as a world out of which all sin has been eradicated; as it is silly to talk of "the break-down of Christianity" when what has really thrust itself into observation is the remaining un-Christianization of the world. Of course we all look forward to a new heaven and a new earth in which righteousness dwells. But there is only one way to get that; and that way is, to use the old phrase, the conversion of the world. It may no doubt seem easier to make the outside of the sepulchre white than to make the bones that fill it live again; but that is because we do not reckon with the Holy Ghost. If men would devote half the energy they are expending in furbishing up the outside of the cup and platter to cleansing out their evil contents, we might hope for some real advance. The law of God is clear, and He has made it the law of social advance: first the spiritual and only then the temporal. We must seek first the kingdom of God, if we would have these other things added to us.

With the matter of poverty and riches before our mind, it may not be superfluous to remind ourselves that the New Testament (if we care for the New Testament) never tells the poor man that he has a right to some of the rich man's wealth. It tells the rich man that he ought to share with the poor: but that is something very different. It is one thing to teach duties and another thing to declare rights. The New Testament is rich in the teaching of duties; it is very sparing in its recommendation to men to assert their rights. Its method of ameliorating the evils of the world is to require of every man that he shall do his full duty, not to inflame any man with a sense of his wrongs and to invite him to demand and take what he deems his rights. It sends Onesimus back to his slavery. It declares the powers that be—that was Nero—to be ordained of God, and requires due obedience to them, on pain of divine judgment. It seems to have the notion (strange no doubt, to modern ears) that every man's concern is with his own duty, not with other people's; and it seems to cherish the expectation (stranger still, no doubt, to modern ears) that if only every man will do all his duty there will be no need for any man to press his rights; and it seems to teach (strangest of all, perhaps, to modern ears) that the best way for a man to get all his rights is to set the example among

men of doing all his duty. That is the New Testament way. It tells slaves to obey their masters, and says not a word to them of the oppression of slavery; it is the masters that it tells not to oppress their slaves and to them that it suggests that they all, masters and slaves, have one common Master, Christ. It tells children to make it a religious duty to obey their parents and says not a word to them of the occasional unreasonableness of parents: it is to the parents alone that it speaks of the possibility of provoking children by injustice. It knows nothing of the demanding of rights: it never tires of the inculcating of duties, even of duties which arise out of oppressive and wrong conditions. Is it not time that our economic leaders should try the New Testament way? That would be a revolution indeed! But it is the first step in the thorough Christianization of the world.

It is easier to cite Jesus' saying that it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God as putting a direct ban on riches, than it is to inquire why it is so hard for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God. There is in fact no condemnation of riches as such here; and no inference can be drawn from the saying that the possession of wealth is in itself wrong. What Jesus meant was that the habit of mind naturally induced by wealth is one unfavorable to the sense of helplessness and need which readily turns in trust to God. We cannot buy our way into the kingdom of God; and when a rich man thinks of acquiring any good it is naturally in the form of purchase that he thinks of it. The rich young ruler proposed to purchase heaven for himself: "What good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life?" Jesus says this is a habit of mind natural to the rich and generalizes: "Children, how hard it is for them that trust in riches to enter into the kingdom of God!" If the kingdom of heaven can be entered only as a child enters the world, naked and utterly dependent,—why, the natural habit of mind of the rich is unfavorable to entrance into it. Jesus might as well have said, How hard it is for a gifted man, or a learned man, or a masterful man, or a self-reliant man, to enter the kingdom of heaven. Had He done so, He would not have been condemning mental and moral gifts, learning, or self-reliance. When Paul declares that not many wise after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble are called, he is not putting a ban on intellectual gifts or high station or noble place. He is only recognizing the dangers which these things bring: the temptations they create to self-dependence and pride. So Jesus is only pointing out that a man accustomed to depend on his riches to supply his needs, will find it hard to turn from them and put his dependence in God alone. It was because He saw that natural tendency of mind in the rich young ruler that He gave him the test, "Sell whatsoever thou hast, and come follow me." That is the test of us all. Whether we depend on wealth or strength, intellect or learning, place or privilege, we must turn from it all and put our trust in Jesus alone or we cannot enter the kingdom of God. Riches are no more in themselves wrong than these

other things,—than say “up-to-date-edness.” And they no more stand in the way of one becoming Jesus’ disciple and “following” Him.

It may perhaps be permitted us in closing to say that we have been interested to observe that Mr. Powell who, because of his traditions, thinks of what he calls “the old theology” in terms of Arminianism, very shrewdly and truly points out (pp. 144, 145) that the Arminian doctrine of what he calls “prevenient grace,” that is, of universal grace, in which he was bred, differs only in words from the new naturalistic doctrine of the essential goodness of man, into which he has drifted. To say that all men come into the world, by reason of “grace,” in a condition in which they can recover themselves to good, if they choose, is only in words different from saying that all men can recover themselves to good if they choose. The “grace,” is postulated only, so to speak, to save appearances; the fact is that all men can recover themselves to good, if they choose. Giving up this Arminian doctrine, “all we have lost,” says Mr. Powell, as we think truly, “is a considerable amount of obscure theological reasoning; and we have gained a more frank and simple approach to the human soul.” But this only amounts to saying that Arminianism is implicit Rationalism, and avoids being explicit Rationalism only by a fiction of “original sin” unillustrated in the actual condition of any human being, because cured in all by another fiction of “universal grace.” If nothing but these fictions stand between us and Rationalism let us be Rationalists by all means. But suppose “original sin” is not a fiction but a fact, ‘and a fact that lies at the heart of Christianity, of which Browning is right in saying that

‘Tis the faith that launched point-blank her dart  
At the head of a lie—taught Original Sin,  
The corruption of Man’s Heart.’

Suppose, in a word that Rationalism, with its dogma of the essential goodness and native perfectibility of man, is an even more obvious fiction than Arminianism with its fictitious original sin and universal grace?

B. B. WARFIELD.

*Princeton, N. J.*

### PRACTICAL THEOLOGY

*Christian Service and the Modern World.* By CHARLES S. MACFARLAND. New York, Chicago, Toronto, London, and Edinburgh: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1915. 8vo, pp. 140.

*Social Evangelism.* By HARRY F. WARD. New York: Missionary Education Movement of the United States and Canada, 1915. 8vo, pp. 145.

These two books are typical of the literature, and specially of the religious literature, of our day. This, as regards its viewpoint, is

characteristically and strikingly social. "In the sphere of the different results between the group action and the sum of the separate action of individuals, we trace the action of the collective mind, conscience and will—something which does not exist apart from the individuals which compose it, but which is yet more than they. It is this something more, this formation and product of the manifold interrelationships of individuals, which is neglected in the evangelism which deals only with individuals" but which is often presented now to the dispragement, if not to the exclusion, of the individual. Indeed, the message of not a few of our pulpits has come to be that social betterment is more important than personal regeneration. Even the dependence of the latter on the former is often affirmed. Perhaps, no doctrine is so popular among a large class of earnest people as that social environment absolutely determines the man. This very common and serious fault both of the volumes under review try to avoid. They distinguish personal from social regeneration; and they succeed, the latter book better than the former, in making personal regeneration first and fundamental. Their witness, consequently, to the truth which they would emphasize, social regeneration, need not be discounted. They do not ground it, as too often has been the case, on error.

The doctrine, moreover, which they would present is one which needs explanation and even defence. Christianity is essentially social. As the Bible is the divine text-book of ethics as well as of dogmatics, so it is the divine textbook of sociology. The Christianity which it teaches is not only to renew the individual, but also to transform society. If Christian dogmatics be presented without Christian ethics, it wants its reason; and if both be set forth without Christian sociology, they lack their purpose. Hence, the demand for social evangelism, for preaching the social truths of the Bible, is a just one. Saved men ought to be taught the kind of life, both individual and social, which they were saved to live. Grant, as we must, that dogmatics is fundamental—what is a foundation, unless we are instructed how to build and are inspired to build on it? There is, then, a large place for such works as those under review. True evangelism must include "social evangelism," and even the church of our day needs to hear the social gospel and ought to preach it. This must be, however, in accordance with the principles of Christ, and it is just at this point that writers of the type represented by these two books commonly err. They violate the independence of the social institutes. To be more specific, they overwork both the church and the state, and to a large degree they ignore the individual. To the last, *as a Christian and because a Christian*, belongs the work of social reform. It is the function of the state only to protect him in, and of the church only to inspire him to, this work. Either enters a sphere other than its own if it essays more. Now such confusion of spheres is, according to Dorner, unchristian because unethical. Not even for the redemption of society may we join together what God has put asunder. Nor does such

presumption go unpunished. In the long run syncretism of every kind issues invariably in inefficiency. State activity will not compensate for the individual initiative which state-control forbids, and the political sermon commonly hinders religion more than it helps politics.

WILLIAM BRENTON GREENE, JR.

*Princeton, N. J.*

*Sub Corona.* Sermons preached in the University Chapel of King's College, Aberdeen. By Principals and Professors of Theological Faculties in Scotland. T. and T. Clark. 1915. Pp. ix. 297.

The preface informs us that "Each preacher has spoken for himself, and is responsible for his own doctrine only; still, when the sermons in this volume are taken together, some trustworthy knowledge will be obtained of the teaching, which prevails at the present time in the Theological Colleges of Scotland."

It is hard to believe that this is a fair and adequate exhibition of theological teaching in Scotland. The book is distinctly disappointing both in thought and in spirit. The term that naturally suggests itself as descriptive of the greater number of the sermons is *slight*. The treatment of great themes is brief and superficial, plays with the fringes of the truth instead of reaching its heart. Where are the deep things of God? Above all, where is the cross? Much is said of social service but we miss the power and passion of the gospel. The distinctive note of Christianity is conspicuously lacking in most of these sermons. Not in all of them indeed. The cross of Christ is lifted up in the discourse on the name of Jesus by Prof. H. R. Mackintosh. But he stands almost alone. We miss the cross, and instead of the constraining power of the love of Christ appeal is made to prudential, social, humanitarian motives.

The sermon by Professor Cooper on "The Supremacy of Love" fails to show why love is the supreme grace of the Christian life; but it concludes with these grateful words: "These two, the Cross and the Supper of the Lord, are the arguments of the Holy Ghost Himself whereby, taking the things of Christ, He shows to the believing soul at once the infinity and the nearness, the glory and the tenderness of the love God hath to us, and sheds abroad within our hearts its all-transforming ray."

J. RITCHIE SMITH.

*Princeton, N. J.*

*The Twelve Apostolic Types of Christian Men.* By Edward A. George. Fleming H. Revell Co. 1916. Pp. 235. \$1 net.

The scholarship is adequate, imagination is exercised under the guidance of sound judgment, the spirit is reverent and sympathetic, and the glorious company of the apostles appear arrayed in flesh and blood, men of like passions with ourselves. The names given them are suggestive—Impetuous Peter, John, the Apostle of Love, Sympathetic

Andrew, James the Martyr, Doubting Thomas, Matthew, the Man of Affairs, Prosaic Philip, Nathaniel the Mystic, Judas the Traitor, the Obscure Three. A chapter is added on the Twelve in Tradition, in Art, in Literature. A study of the book will add new interest to the gospel story by introducing us to a more intimate acquaintance with the men who fill so large a place in it.

In the sketch of Nathaniel reasons might well be given for identifying him with Bartholomew. In citing Mark 1:10-34, why not preserve *straightway* throughout with the Revised Version, instead of changing to *forthwith*, as A. V., and *immediately*, which should be omitted in v. 31? It is surprising to find how many writers neglect the more accurate renderings of the R. V. It would add to the interest and value of the volume if more space were given to the traditions of the early church, especially those that gather about the beloved disciple. Attention may be directed to the study of Judas as especially fresh and interesting. Something more might be made of the story of Simon the Zealot as illustrating the power of Jesus over men who seem most hostile to the principles of his Kingdom and his spirit.

J. RITCHIE SMITH.

Princeton, N. J.

*The Parables of the Old Testament.* By Clarence Edward Macartney, Minister Arch Street Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, Pa. Fleming H. Revell Co. 1916. Pp. 122. 75 cents net.

As Dr. Macartney intimates in the preface he finds few predecessors in this field. One reason no doubt for the neglect of this portion of Scripture is the superiority of the parables of the New Testament. Dr. Macartney remarks that "the difference between the Parables of Jesus and those of the Old Testament consists in the fact that nearly all the Parables of Jesus teach a spiritual truth that is timeless, and has no particular relation to or connection with the occasion or condition of utterance." The second clause of the sentence should be more carefully guarded. Jesus' Parables do in fact in many instances reflect the circumstances that called them forth. They are largely occasional, as was all his teaching, and to this they owe much of their freshness and power. The Parable of the Lost Sheep, for example, to which Dr. Macartney refers by way of illustration, was provoked by the murmuring of the Scribes and Pharisees when publicans and sinners drew near to hear him. But it is true that we find in the Parables of our Lord a larger, richer, fuller teaching than in the Parables of the Old Scripture. Yet they too have a message for today, and deserve our study. Dr. Macartney has shown that we may discover in these early stories foreshadowings of the great truths of the gospel.

Nine Parables are treated: Of the Trees, of the Thistle and the Cedar, of the Lost Prisoner, of the Ewe Lamb, of the Woman of Tekoah, of the Vineyard, of the Faithless Wives, of the Two Eagles and the Vine, of the Ploughman. The book furnishes an excellent ex-

ample of expository preaching, for the Parables were expounded in the pulpit. The style is lucid and pleasing, the interpretation scholarly, the application skillful and faithful. The cross is lifted high as the only hope of men. "The true church must be faithful to the Cross of Christ. It is the wisdom of God set over against the wisdom of the world. . . . It is possible to say a great many things that are true and beautiful concerning the Cross and yet leave unsaid the chief thing, the thing that engaged the thought and created the enthusiasm of the first heralds of the Cross, that on the Cross Christ gave Himself a ransom for the sins of many" (pp. 92, 93).

J. RITCHIE SMITH.

Princeton, N. J.

*Words of This Life.* By the Rev. W. Mackintosh Mackay, B.D. Sherbrooke Church, Glasgow. George H. Doran Co. pp. xi, 299. \$1.25 net.

The volume contains twenty sermons. The style is clear and pleasant, though not particularly striking, the truth is put in a fresh and interesting way; and valuable lessons are drawn from the text. Those who have read the Canterbury Tales will be surprised to learn that "there is one filthy tale almost in the whole collection"; a judgment more charitable than correct. Heb. ii.16 is cited from the incorrect rendering of the A. V. It is surprising that in so many instances preachers seem to be ignorant of the Revised Version, or neglect to make use of it. In the sermon on "The transfiguration of Satan" the obvious and almost inevitable remark, that Satan may be the more readily transformed into an angel of light because he was an angel of light in the beginning, is nowhere made. It is hardly fair to suggest that Samuel Johnson's religious views may have had something to do with his fear of death, because "he was a High Churchman, and the Catholic form of our Christiaian faith does little to lighten the fear of death" (282). Both the fear of death and freedom from that fear are found in all communions. Dr. Johnson's melancholy disposition and impaired health furnish a sufficient explanation of his dread of the hereafter.

The sermon on "The Fatherhood of God" is wanting in careful discrimination. There is a sense in which God is the Father of all men in that he has made them in his own image. That natural Fatherhood is clearly recognized in the Scripture, and lies at the basis of the Incarnation and of the appeal which the Gospel makes to man. But it is everywhere subordinated to that ethical and spiritual relation which he sustains to those who believe upon his Son and have been born again of his Spirit. These aspects of the Divine Fatherhood should not be confounded. God is not the Father of all men in the same sense in which he is the Father of believers. And the subject should never be treated without drawing a sharp distinction between what God is by nature to all men and what he becomes by grace to those who receive his Son.

But though the sermon fails to draw this distinction, the need of the Atonement is recognized and pressed. "I do believe with all my heart in the common Fatherhood of God. But yet if that were to mean the cutting of the Cross out of the Bible as the ground of my acceptance with God, then I, for one, would go back to the old view of God as the Judge of men and not their Father. For to my mind the Atonement is the heart and centre of the Gospel" (p. 112). The message of the preacher is gathered up in Christ. "It is Christ and Christ alone that can help men to live that holy life and to die that holy death which can alone prepare them to meet with God" (p. 298).

J. RITCHIE SMITH.

Princeton, N. J.

*Great Ideas of Religion.* By J. G. SIMPSON, Canon and Precentor of St. Paul's. George H. Doran Co. 1912. Pp. xxxii. 315. \$1.50 net.

The book is largely concerned with the principles of Christian Socialism, as the Preface indicates. A certain vagueness and thinness of thought must be recognized. Great themes are not grasped with a firm hand. This is conspicuously true of the sermon on "Christ and Marriage", with its statement "now I do not think it can be fairly asserted that our Divine Lord ever intended to establish a positive marriage law in the Christian church" (p. 218). The clear and precise statements of the Scripture are set aside. Historical events give way to philosophical speculations. "It is not therefore a refusal to believe, it is the sheer, inexorable necessities of thought which constrain us to assert that the story of the creation is not, and cannot be, a matter of historical fact" (p 23). "The Christian doctrine of creation is that Christ is the religious interpretation of the universe" (p. 24). "'In the beginning God created, is no more a historical statement than are the words with which St. John introduces the story of redemption—'In the beginning was the Word'" (p. 27). No more, but no less. "What the phrase 'God made the world' means, if it be regarded as a philosophical proposition, is quite uncertain" (p. 28). "It is not really relevant to inquire whether at any given time in an obscure past there occurred an event which may be properly described as a Fall" (p. 42). Surely a doctrine to which such importance is attached both in the Old Testament and in the New should not be dismissed in this summary fashion. These citations are sufficient to illustrate and confirm what was said of the general character of the book. There are other statements to which exception might be taken; in interpreting James ii.2—"It is not so much the deference paid to the gold ring, as the gold ring itself, upon which the prophet looks with dubious eyes" (p. 188); "when I look at Jesus Christ I do not see in Him any answer to the great metaphysical and moral difficulties which underlie existence" (p. 129). Is he not the truth, and are we not to love him with the mind as with the heart? But it is pleasant to close our review with words to which we may heartily assent, "No reading of the Gospel narrative can for a

moment lay claim to historical continuity with the Christianity of all ages for which the death of Christ is not the fact of crucial significance" (p. 122).

J. RITCHIE SMITH.

Princeton, N. J.

*Some Spiritual Lessons of the War.* By HENRY PHIPPS DENNISON, B. A. The Young Churchman Co., Milwaukee, Wis. 1915. Pp. 67.  
*So as by Fire.* Notes on the War. By HENRY SCOTT HOLLAND, D.D., D.Litt. Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford and Canon of Christ Church. Young Churchman Co., Milwaukee, Wis. Pp. 120. 40 cents.

The cause of England and the Allies against Germany is ably and vigorously presented. It is particularly gratifying to note in Prof. Holland's book, which is much the stronger of the two, the absence of that spirit of bitterness and hate which has filled the hearts of multitudes on both sides. These are his closing words—"Christ is the King of Peace. We stand with Christ, for peace and goodwill to all mankind. Goodwill towards Germany! Peace with the good German people! We look for nothing but that, as our goal. God grant it swiftly!"

Mr. Denison addresses himself "Not to the natural faculties with which you were born, but to those spiritual faculties of Faith, Hope and Charity that you acquired in your Baptism, and that none of the unbaptized possess" (p. 11). Heb. 2:16 is cited, though incorrectly, and interpreted as it appears in the A. V.—"He took not on him the nature of angels, but he took the seed of Abraham" (p. 35).

Professor Holland has this to say of our own country, "America took occasion from the War, not to belittle the work of the Hague but to magnify it. . . . America, by standing neutral, has embodied the International Judgment, and this judgment has counted for much" (pp. 36, 37). He believes there are several things that will be consumed in this Judgment of Fire that has fallen upon Europe—"the assumption by the white man of the supremacy of his own civilization, and of his right to exploit men of another color," the iniquity of an appeal to force as the elementary basis of society"; "class jealousies, class antagonisms, class hatreds" (pp. 70-73). The book is well worth reading for its wide outlook and Christian spirit.

J. RITCHIE SMITH.

Princeton, N. J.

*Six Fools.* By ROLLO FRANKLIN HURLBURT. Methodist Book Concern. 1916. Pp. 284. \$1 net.

This is a series of ethical essays, "designed to show the folly of certain courses of living." The characters portrayed are the Young Fool, the Companion Fool, the Woman Fool, the Rich Fool, the King Fool, the no-God Fool. The book is well written, and deals vigorously and in general wisely with the conditions and problems of modern life.

The author is frequently drawn from the judgment of folly to the praise of wisdom, and the wise often holds a larger place than the fool. The essay on the Woman Fool is devoted mainly to the virtues and achievements of the sex, and closes with a hearty endorsement of woman suffrage.

In the essay on the No-God Fool the universal Fatherhood of God is affirmed, and allusion is made to the teaching of our Lord. But when Jesus used the term Father it was almost invariably with reference to himself or to his disciples. There are few doctrines in which the need of careful discrimination is more urgent than in the doctrine of the Divine Fatherhood, which involves both a natural and gracious relation. It is good to find in a volume of this character the Gospel note so clearly struck. "When we start on our journey back from the far country we find that God comes a good deal more than halfway to meet us at the cross of Christ. We never will get back to the Father's house unless we come by the way of Calvary" (p. 239).

J. RITCHIE SMITH.

*Princeton, N. J.*

*This Hour not the Hour of the Prince of Peace.* By I. M. HALDEMAN, D.D. Charles C. Cook. 1916. Pp. 56.

This sermon, preached in the Brooklyn Baptist Temple before the New York State Convention, Oct 27, 1915, follows the familiar lines of premillennial teaching. Those who accept that teaching will find here something to confirm their faith; those who do not accept it will find little to convince.

J. RITCHIE SMITH.

*Princeton, N. J.*

*The Chaplain and The War.* By J. ESSLEMONT ADAMS, B.D., Chaplain to the Forces. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street. 1915. 8vo, pp. 61. 6d. net.

A vivid and moving discription of the opportunities and the work of the army chaplain in the present European war. One can scarcely read it and keep from exclaiming, "Surely the wrath of man shall praise thee: the remainder of wrath shalt thou restrain" (Ps. lxxvi, 10).

WILLIAM BRENTON GREENE, JR.

*Princeton, N. J.*

*The Colors of the Republic.* By THE REV. GEORGE CRAIG STEWART, L. H. D., Rector of St. Luke's Church, Evanston, Ill. Milwaukee: The Young Churchman Co. 1915. 8vo, pp. 64.

These colors stand; the red for War, the white for Purity, the blue for Religion: and this attractive booklet is an earnest, strong, inspiring plea for devotion to Church and State, to God and Country, even unto death.

*The Christian Laborer in the Industrial Struggle.* By PROF. L. BERKHOF, B. D. Publishers, Erdmans-Swensma Co.: Grand Rapids, Mich. 1916. 4to, pp. 31.

The writer shows that with reference to "the labor problem, one of the greatest problems of our age," "the Christian laborer" must unfurl his banner and take a position all his own"; that this position may not be one of "resignation and non-resistance"; that on the other hand, it may not be one of alliance with any of the many forms of socialism—the socialism that "sways the masses to-day" is "the exact antipode of the Christian view of the world and of life"; that neither can it express itself through the existing labor-unions—"the prevailing spirit in the unions generally is grossly materialistic and is bound to have a blighting effect on the lives of those Christians that affiliate with them"; and "consequently" that Christian laborers should "organize separately," and preferably "as separate industries and in organizations in which employers and employees are brought together." We know not which to admire the most in this noble lecture, its learning, its good sense, its justice, its courage, its Christian spirit. We could wish for it a world-wide circulation. Even though at first few may listen, it is a great thing that the whole truth should have been so spoken.

WILLIAM BRENTON GREENE, JR.

Princeton, N. J.

*America's Greatest Problem: The Negro.* By R. W. SHUFELDT, M.D. F. A. Davis Company, Philadelphia. 1915. Pp. xii, 377. \$2.50.  
*American Civilization and the Negro.* The Afro-American in Relation to National Progress. By C. V. ROMAN, A.M., M.D., LL.D. F. A. Davis Company, Philadelphia. 1916. Pp. xii, 434, \$2.50.

These two volumes on the Negro in the United States represent opposed points of view. Dr. Shufeldt is a white man born in the north but claiming that his long service in various parts of the country with the Medical Corps of the U. S. Army has given him an exact knowledge of that whereof he writes. Dr. Roman is a Negro, Professor in the Meharry Medical College, Nashville, and Editor of the "Journal of the National Medical Association," the representative organ of the Negro physicians of the United States, and so, presumably, entirely competent to speak with authority.

Dr. Shufeldt's opinion is that since the white man represents the highest and the Negro the lowest stage of evolution yet attained by the human race, and since the animal traits of the Negro are irradicable, the greatest danger confronting the United States today is the inter-mixture of the races—a danger only to be prevented by the deportation of the Negro to Africa. In support of his position the author adduces a mass of evidence some of it true and much of it false. Thus it is true that individual Negroes are guilty of revolting crimes, that the percentage of disease is higher than among the whites, and that the death rate is much higher. But it is false to assert that what is

true of the individual is true of the race and it is absurd to say that *the Negro has in fact no morals, and it is therefore out of the question for him to be immoral* (p. 37). Again the statement that the death rate among Negroes is increasing is not borne out by the Bureau of the Census, Bulletin 129, page 45, where it is said to have decreased from 29.4 per 1000 in 1900 to 25.5 per 1000 in 1910. The chapter on "Criminality" contains, however, the most serious misstatement of fact. It is not true that the greater part of Negro crime consists of assaults upon white women and that to this are due the lynchings. Mr. Monroe N. Work, in charge of Division of Records and Research, Tuskegee Institute, shows on page 314 of the Negro Year Book for 1914-1915, that less than one quarter of the lynchings of Negroes is due to such assaults, and that the figures for commitments for rape are per 1000 of the population 1.9 for Negro and 2.3 for white. Again, the figures for Negro crime show since 1895 a steady decrease. The "sexuality" argument is overworked by Dr. Shufeldt. Many of his statements as to sex instinct are no longer held by reputable psychologists, and his assertions as to the increase in marital relations between Negro and white are contradicted by all competent observers whom the reviewer has interviewed. Finally the enormous crime of transporting an entire people to a continent where the majority would die from the insalubrious surroundings and where they would be compelled to begin life over again, without their consent, after the service they have rendered the white race through centuries of toil, admits of no defense. The atrocities on the Congo and the cruelties of the Putumayo are insignificant compared with what would result from such a deed.

Dr. Roman aims to show that savagery and criminality are not the exclusive characteristics of the Negro. His argument is not unlike that of Shylock in the Merchant of Venice (reading Negro in place of Jew and White Man in place of Christian): *Hath not a Jew eyes? Hath not a Jew hands, organs, dimensions, senses, affections, passions? fed with the same food, hurt with the same weapons, subject to the same diseases, heal'd by the same means, warm'd and cool'd by the same winter and summer, as a Christian is? If you prick us, do we not bleed? if you tickle us, do we not laugh? if you poison us, do we not die?* On the basis of this communion of characters the author appeals for sympathy. His thought is that the Negro can and will make his contribution to the life of the country if only he is not deprived of the means of advance, if he is treated as a human being and a neighbor.

All will agree that the Negro constitutes a danger to the United States. In so far Dr. Shufeldt is right. But the danger will not be removed but rather enhanced by depriving the Negro of education, segregating him in unhealthy slums, denying to him the protection of the laws, collecting full fare from him and then crowding him into filthy and unsafe railway coaches, taking from him the means of life, liberty and happiness. In protesting against this treatment Dr. Roman

is right. No solution of the Negro problem is possible unless all the factors of solution are considered and we may be sure that any proposal, however "scientific" it may claim to be, is foredoomed to failure if it does not take account of moral obligation and religious duty towards those whom the Providence of God has made our neighbors.

GEORGE JOHNSON.

*Lincoln University, Pa.*

---

## GENERAL LITERATURE

*Methods and Aims in the Study of Literature.* By LANE COOPER. Ginn & Company, New York.

Professor Cooper, in his Wordsworth Concordance, his study of Aristotle, and other works, has for a series of years made valid contributions to English literary study. In the work before us, it is his purpose to explain literary methods and aims, concretely exemplified in a large selection of extracts. The six sections of the volume treat of Method in General, Method in The Study of Literature, Extracts from Wordsworth on The Study of Poetry, Illustrations of The Practice of Great Writers in Composing, The Studies of Poets, and Method in The Poetry of Love. The treatment is thus rhetorical as well as literary, placing at the disposal of the student valuable instruction and examples as to written composition and the study of verse. Professor Cooper has avoided the error of dealing with method as a mere logical order and process by showing its necessary relation to poetic passion—"the marriage of law and impulse" or "the bond between rigorous method and the artistic utterance of passion."

T. W. HUNT.

*Princeton University.*

*Literary Middle English Reader.* By ALBERT S. COOK. Ginn & Company, New York.

Professor Cook throughout his educational career has laid special emphasis upon the study of Old English, in such editions as "Judith," and "Siever's Grammar of Old English." In the volume before us, he is dealing with Middle English, and from the literary point of view, and is particularly anxious to offer an edition intelligible to the average English student. The vocabulary is thus reduced to the minimum and given on the respective pages in connection with the text, while the selections in prose and verse are carefully made in obedience to the needs of all English students. After a brief introduction on the Middle English Literature and Language and a helpful bibliography, he gives examples of Romances, Tales, Chronicles, Stories of Travel, Religious and Didactic Pieces, Illustrations of Life and Manners, Translations, Lyrics and Plays, illustrated respectively in Malory, Chaucer, Layamon, Mandeville, Richard Rolle, The Minorite Friars, Wiclit, Minot and The

York Nativity Play, a comprehensive and instructive collection, giving the reader as useful an account as he can find of these Pre-Elizabethan texts. The prefaces as to texts and authors are especially helpful, while the scholar and general reader alike will find sufficient material to satisfy their respective tastes.

The edition may be heartily recommended to all lovers of our Mediaeval English.

T. W. HUNT.

*Princeton University.*

*Union League Address.* By DR. NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER, President of Columbia University in the City of New York, to the Members of the Union League of Philadelphia at Founders' Day Celebration held Saturday evening, November 27, 1915.

A stirring appeal for the recognition by the United States of her international responsibility, especially in view of the problems raised by the great European war.

*The Postal Power of Congress, a Study on Constitutional Expansion.* By LINDSAY ROGERS, Ph.D., L.L.B., Adjunct Professor of Political Science in the University of Virginia. "No. 2 in Series xxxiv. Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science under the Direction of the Department of History, Political Economy, and Political Science."

"This admirable essay has for its purpose to trace the legislative and judicial history of the grant to Congress of the powers 'to establish post-offices and post-roads' and to discuss the constitutionality of the proposals that, under this clause, federal control may be extended to subjects over which Congress has no direct authority."

WILLIAM BRENTON GREENE, JR.

*Princeton, N. J.*

*The New York Stock Exchange in the Crisis of 1914.* By H. G. S. NOBLE, President New York Stock Exchange. The Country Life Press: Garden City, New York, 1915. 8vo, pp. 89.

Admirably concise, clear, interesting and instructive. It would seem that no one could read President Noble's pamphlet without a deeper appreciation of the importance of the Stock Exchange, of the responsibility of its officers, and of the essential righteousness and charity of their administration.

*The Constitutional Doctrines of Justice Harlan.* Series xxxiii, No. 4, John Hopkins University Studies on Historical and Political Science under the Direction of the Departments of History, Political Economy, and Political Science. By FLOYD BARZILIA CLARK, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Political Science in Pennsylvania State College. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. 1915. 8vo, pp. 208.

A very careful study of the constitutional doctrines of one of the great judges of our Supreme Court as found in his dissenting opinions.

*The Boycott in American Trade Unions.* Series XXXIV, No. 1, Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science under the Direction of the Departments of History, Political Economy, and Political Science. By LEO WOLMAN, Ph.D., Fellow in Political Economy. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. 1916. 8vo. pp. 148.

Probably the most thorough study ever made of this pressing question.

*Misrepresentation and Concealments in Opposition to Reform in the American Historical Association.* By FREDERIC BANCROFT. Washington, D. C.: National Capital Press. 1916. Pamph., pp. 22.

This is Part III of Why the American Historical Association needs Thorough Reorganization, and it would seem to justify its contention.

*The Reign of The Prince of Peace.* By RICHARD HAYES McCARTNEY, Author of "the Coming of the King," "That Jew," "The Lady of Nations," "Songs in the Waiting," "The Imperial," "The Anti-Christ," "The Whip of God," etc. New York: Charles C. Cook, 150 Nassau Street. 8vo., pp. 160.

A poem descriptive of the glory of the consummation of the reign of Christ. It lacks neither imagination nor facility in rhyming.

*A Brief Bibliography of Books in English, Spanish and Portuguese relating to the Republics commonly called Latin American with Comments.* By PETER H. GOLDSMITH, Director of the Pan American Division of the American Association for International Conciliation, New York: The Macmillan Company. 1915. 8vo, pp. xix, 107.

An indispensable handbook for any one intending to travel in South America or to study any of its countries.

WILLIAM BRENTON GREENE, JR.

Princeton, N. J.

## PERIODICAL LITERATURE

*American Journal of Theology*, Chicago, April: GEORGE B. FOSTER, Contribution of Critical Scholarship to Ministerial Efficiency; GEORGE E. WOLFE, Troeltsch's Conception of the Significance of Jesus; JAMES W. THOMPSON, The German Church and the Conversion of the Baltic Slavs; SYDNEY H. MELLONE, Degrees of Truth; ARTHUR C. WATSON, The Logic of Religion; FRANK EAKIN, Aorists and Perfects in the First Century Papyri.

*Bibliotheca Sacra*, Oberlin, April: E. S. BUCHANAN, Ancient Testimony to the Early Corruption of the Gospels; DAVID S. SCHAFF, Jerome of Prague and the Five Hundredth Anniversary of his Birth; HAROLD M. WIENER, Professor Lofthouse and the Criticism of the Pentateuch

(iii); O. W. FIRKINS, Criticism; JOHN E. BUSHNELL, Perils of American Democracy; BERNARD C. STEINER, Keynotes of the Centuries in Relation to the Great War; G. FREDERICK WRIGHT, Periodicity a Law of Nature; E. G. MARTIN, A Day of Rest in Nature and Human Nature.

*Church Quarterly Review*, London, April: HERBERT KELLY, German Idealism; H. C. BEECHING, Shakespeare as a Churchman; BISHOP OF LICHFIELD, National Mission of Repentance and Hope; M. W. T. CONRAN, The National Mission—a Suggestion; A. T. COLDMAN, Some Moral Problems of the War; J. O. F. MURRAY, The Empty Tomb, The Resurrection of the Body and The Intermediate State; ARTHUR C. HEADLAM, The Russian and English Churches; ROSE GRAHAM, Life at Cluny in the Eleventh Century; J. WICKHAM LEGG, The Paenula and Chasuble; A. HAMILTON BAYNES, Our Lord's View of the Future; The War—the Task Before Us.

*Constructive Quarterly*, New York, June: DAVID S. SCHAFF, Movement toward Church Unity; W. B. SELBIE, The War, Revival and Reunion; LEONID TURKEVICH, The Church and the Choir; GILBERT REID, Appreciation of Another's Faith; N. R. BEST, The Free Church Viewpoint; GEORGES MICHELET, The War and the Moral Crisis; W. C. GORGAS, Sanitation and Morality; GEORGE WOBBERMIN, Theology from the Viewpoint of the Science of Religion; GEORGE W. RICHARDS, Kantian Philosophy and Christian Theology; JOHN E. MERCER, The Churches and Secularist Democrats; LESTER L. RILEY, Social Worship; NEWMAN SMYTH, John Dury.

*East & West*, London, April: DR. WALMSLEY, West Africa and the War; CHARLES W. FARQUHAR, New Methods and Old Problems in West Africa; J. L. BARTON, American Missions in Turkey; D. MACFADYEN, Missionary Education in America; BARAKAT ULLAH, Conflict of Religions in the Punjab; W. C. B. PURSER, Christian Hermit in Burma; HERBERT KELLY, Pattern of a Missionary Church; P. B. EMMET, Our Attitude toward Hinduism; Boniface, the Apostle of Germany.

*Expositor*, London, April: J. H. BERNARD, Descent into Hades, and Christian Baptism; C. W. EMMET, Romans 15 and 16: a New Theory; R. H. STRACHAN, Birth of a New Message, Isaiah 40:1-II; W. MORISON, Christ's Confidence in His Doctrine of the Fatherhood of God; ALPHONSE MINGANA, Remarks on the Hebrew of Genesis; J. E. MACFADYEN, Mosaic Origin of the Decalogue: The Fourth Commandment. *The Same*, May: GEORGE EDMUNDSON, Enigma of Titus; WILLIAM TURNER and ALEXANDER SIMPSON, Physical Cause of Death of Christ; J. M. THOMPSON, Interpretation of John 6; FRANK GRANGER, Semitic Element in Fourth Gospel; F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK, "Every Creature" not "All Creation" in Romans 8:22; J. E. MACFADYEN, Mosaic Origin of Decalogue: Second Commandment. *The Same*, June: J. H. BERNARD, Gates of Hades; JAMES MOFFATT, St. Augustine's Advice to an Army Officer; H. F. MOULE, Greek Text of Erasmus; F. H. COLSON, The Divorce Exception in St. Matthew; H. A. A. KENNEDY, Regulative Value of the Pauline Theology of the Conception of Christian Sonship;

BERNARD H. TOWER, St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians: a Paraphrase. *Expository Times*, Edinburgh, May: Notes of Recent Exposition; ADELA M. ADAM, Mysticism of Greece; H. R. MACKINTOSH, Revelation of God in Christ; W. M. RAMSAY, The Denials of Peter; J. WAR-SCHAUER, Mystery of the Kingdom.

*Harvard Theological Review*, Cambridge, April: FRANCIS G. PEABODY, University Preaching: R. F. ALFRED HOERNLÉ, The Religious Aspect of Bertrand Russell's Philosophy; GEORGE HARRIS, Ethics of College Students: GEORGE P. ADAMS, Mystery God and Olympian God.

*Hibbert Journal*, Boston, April; BERGSON, Life and Matter at War; L. P. JACKS, Tyranny of Mere Things; EVELYN UNDERHILL, Problems of Conflict; PERCY GARDNER and A. W. F. BLUNT, Two Studies of German "Kultur"; HERMANN KEYSERLING, On the Meaning of War; MAUDE E. KING, Gothic Ruin and Reconstruction; E. F. CARRITT, "Shall We Serve God for Nought?"; M. W. ROBIESON, German Socialist Theory and War; J. M. SLOAN, Carlyle's Germans: C. MARSH BEADNELL, Mind and Matter: a Hylozoistic View; LAIRD W. SNELL, Method of Christian Science; FRANCIS E. CLARK, The Christian Endeavor Movement; CECIL PRICE, The Boy Scouts.

*International Journal of Ethics*, Concord, April: JOHN DEWEY, Progress; A. K. ROGERS, Formulas for State Action; MORRIS R. COHEN, Real and Ideal Forces in Civil Law; S. P. ORTH, Law and Force in International Affairs; JOHN DEWEY, Force and Coercion; G. M. STRATTON, Docility of the Fighter: C. D. BROAD, On the Function of False Hypotheses in Ethics; W. S. URQUHART, Philosophical Inheritance of Rabindranath Tagore; DURANT DRAKE, May Belief Outstrip Evidence?

*Interpreter*, London, April: LESLIE JOHNSTON, The Suffering Servant in St. Mark; ARTHUR WRIGHT, St. Stephen the Proto-Martyr; H. H. B. AYLES, Authorship of the First Gospel; R. H. MALDEN, Spiritualism; ARCHIBALD DUFF, Date of Book of Lamentations; A. C. BOUQUET, Trying to see Both Sides; F. S. GUY WARMAN, Doctrine of Grace in Relation to the Sacraments of the Gospel; A. D. PHILLIPS, Liberals and Catholicism.

*Irish Theological Quarterly*, Dublin, April: J. KELLEHER, Father Slater on Just Price and Value; E. F. SUTCLIFFE, The Divine Carpenter; J. M. O'SULLIVAN, Some Prejudices of Criticism; GARRETT PIERSE, The Human Character of Jesus; a Proof of His Divinity.

*Jewish Quarterly Review*, Philadelphia, April: ISRAEL LEBENDIGER, The Minor in Jewish Law i-iii; ISRAEL I. EFROS, Problem of Space in Jewish Medieval Philosophy; M. H. SEGAL, Studies in the Books of Samuel. ii.

*Journal of Theological Studies*, London, April: C. H. TURNER, An Ancient Homiliary (of St. Maximus of Turin); C. H. TURNER, Arles and Rome; the First Development of Canon Law in Gaul; V. BARTLET, Ordination Prayers in the Ancient Church Order; C. LATTEY, Deification of Man in Clement of Alexandria: Some Further Notes; R. B. TOLLINTON, Two Elements in Marcion's Dualism; E. I. ROBSON,

Rhythm and Intonation in St. Mark 1-10; W. W. COVEY-CRUMP, Situation of Tarshish; F. C. BURKITT, Last Supper and Paschal Meal.

*London Quarterly Review*, London, April. H. R. MACKINTOSH, Theology, Life, and War; GEORGE W. THORN, Dostoevsky as a Psychologist; T. ALEXANDER SNEED, Shakespeare's Ideals of Heroic Manhood; H. MALDWYN HUGHES, Can We Still Be Christians?: T. H. S. ESCOTT, Wellington and Blücher; ARTHUR T. BURBRIDGE, Doctrine of the Social Trinity; E. J. THOMPSON, Samson Agonistes; COULSON KERNANAHAN, Last Days of Theodore Watts-Dunton.

*Lutheran Church Review*, Philadelphia, April: H. J. SCHUH, What Can Be Done to Bring about More Fraternal Relations Among the Different Branches of the Lutheran Church in This Country? FREDERICK A. REITER, Jack London's The Star Rover; G. H. SCHODDE, Luther and the Scriptures: GEORGE M. STEPHENSON, John Huss and Religious Liberty; THEODORE E. SCHMAUK, The Garden City Conference on Faith and Order; ROBERT C. HORN, A New Greek New Testament Grammar; LEANDER S. KEYSER, Relation of Scriptures to Doctrine. ii; GEORGE J. FRITSCHEL, Luther and the Form of Concord: JUNIUS B. REMENSNYDER, The Holy Catholic Church in the Ecumenical Creeds: D. H. BAUSLIN, Lutheran Ideals in America as Opposed to Calvinistic and Arminian: M. REU, Religious Instruction during the Sixteenth Century.

*Lutheran Quarterly*, Gettysburg, April: JACOB A. CLUTZ, How Can a Seminary Student Get the Most out of His Seminary Course? ALFRED FAULKNER, Melanchthon's Doctrinal Differences from Luther; J. M. HANTZ, Man's Pre-eminence among Creatures; GRAYSON Z. STUP, Millennial Dawn, or Russellism.

*Methodist Review*, New York, May-June: JAMES M. BUCKLEY, Study our Episcopacy—Final Article; P. T. FORSYTH, The First and the Second Adam; W. A. QUAYLE, Taking One's Self Too Seriously; CHRISTIAN F. REISNER, Bishop Henry White Warren: a Tribute; JAMES M. DIXON, Religion and Aestheticism; E. T. IGLEHART, The Japan Methodist Church; A. F. CALDWELL, Stoke Pogis and the Elegy; ELLA B. HALLOCK, How We Listened to Browning's "Easter Day"; HALFORD E. LUCCOCK, The Advertising Man Talks; S. A. LOUGH, The Minister's Study of Literature; GEORGE A. NEELD, Rabindranath Tagore: FRANK O. BECK, George Borrow, A Literary Esau.

*Methodist Review Quarterly*, Nashville, April: EDITOR, Star of the Bab: S. PARKES CADMAN, Monasticism in the Christian Church; H. K. ANET, The War and Protestantism in Belgium and France; W. D. WEATHERFORD, Booker T. Washington; EDWIN M. RANDALL, A Suggestion Concerning Unification; E. R. HENDRIX, Foreign Missions and Methodist Union; EDITOR, The Lion Gospel; CHARLES O. JONES, Arrested Development Intellectually of the Preacher; G. B. WINTON, The United States a World-Power; J. C. GRANBERY, Suggestions for Greek Testament Study; E. D. MOUZON, The Bible; Its Value as a Source of Christian Theology; CHARLES H. PRATHER, Francis Asbury,

Apostle; ELAM F. DEMPSEY, Francis Asbury, The Theologian; E. C. BROOKS, Francis Asbury an Educational Reformer; E. P. PARHAM, Jesse Lee, Methodist Historian; W. W. MARTIN, Chronology of the Sethites.

*Monist*, Chicago, April: RAFFAELLO PICCOLI, Benedetto Croce's Esthetic; GOTTLÖB FREGE, Fundamental Laws of Arithmetic; Psychological Logic; S. RADHAKRISHNAN, Vedantic Approach to Reality; LEO C. ROBERTSON, Conception of Brahma; PAUL CARUS, The Trinity.

*Moslem World*, London, April: W. A. RICE, Transfer of Allegiance; W. H. T. GAIRDNER, Doctrine of the Unity in Trinity (iii); C. D. USSHER, Armenian Atrocities and the Jihad; S. M. ZWEMER, Islam in South America; DR. FRÖLICH, Islam in Nubia; R. F. MCNEILE, The Koran according to Ahmad; MRS. BRENTON-CAREY, Moslem Women in Sindh; V. CHIROL, Nationalism and War in the Near East; J. D. FRAME, Doctor as Preacher; E. W. PUTNEY, Moslem Philosophy of Education.

*Reformed Church Review*, Lancaster, April: R. C. SCHIEDT, America's Achievement in the Realm of Exact Science; T. G. HELM, Wendell Phillips and the Abolition Movement; WILLIAM N. APPFL, Secularizing the Church; RAY H. DOTTERER, Theory of Value Implied by Schopenhauer's Pessimism; CHARLES E. SCHAFFER, What a Theological Student Should Know about Home Missions; ALLEN R. BARTHOLOMEW, Missions Essential to the Life of the Church; A. V. HIESTER, Cause of Social Unrest of Our Day.

*Review and Expositor*, Louisville, April: E. Y. MULLINS, Response of Jesus Christ to Modern Thought; LEN G. BROUGHTON, "Is the Policy of President Wilson for National Defence Unchristian? Mr. Bryan says it is." R. E. NEIGHBOR, The New Birth and the Conversation with Nicodemus; JOHN H. EAGER, The Bible and the Popes; S. M. PROVENCE, The Book of Job; an Interpretation; O. O. FLETCHER, The Existence of God: a Study of the Religious Consciousness; W. W. EVERETTS, Robert Calef and Cotton Mather; SAMUEL Z. BATTEN, The Divine Life in Man.

*Union Seminary Review*, Richmond, April: WALTER L. LINGLE, Teachings of Jesus and Modern Social Problems; W. P. McCORKLE, May a General Assembly Grant a Re-Hearing of a Case Decided by a Previous Assembly? JOHN F. CANNON, Mission of the Church; RUSSELL CECIL, Unity of the Church; ROBERT E. VINSON, Book Study of the Epistle of James; EUGENE C. CALDWELL, Theme and Analysis of the Epistle of James.

*Yale Review*, New Haven, April: MOORFIELD STOREY, President Wilson's Administration; GEORGE B. ADAMS, America's Obligation and Opportunity; WILBUR C. ABBOTT, The War and American Democracy; H. G. DWIGHT, Campaign in Western Asia; HARVEY CUSHING, With the British Medical Corps in France; GAMALIEL BRADFORD, Charles Sumner; MORRELL W. GAINES, Federal Valuation of Railroads; HENRY A. BEERS, Emerson and His Journals; HUGH WALKER, The Wise Men

Who have Passed for Fools; DANIEL C. GILMAN, Letters from Russia During the Crimean War.

*Bilychnis*, Roma, Febbraio: MARIO ROSSI, Praga, la "città d'oro," all 'alba dell' ussítismo; ANTONINO DE STEFANO, I Tedeschi nell 'opinione pubblica medievale; PAOLO ORANO, Il Papa a congresso; GIOVANNI COSTA, L'Austria luterana e la Dalmazia italiana; MARIO ROSSI, Razze, religioni e Stato in Italia secondo un libro tedesco e secondo l'ultimo censimento. *The Same*, Marzo: Avv. GIOVANNI E. MEILLE, Lo sterminio di un popolo; PAOLO TUCCI, La guerra nelle grandi parole di Gesù; GIOVANNI PIOLI, Un episodio romantico e tragico della "Repubblica Romana"; ILLE EGO, Il "modernismo" che non muore. *The Same*, Aprile: GUGLIELMO QUADROTTA, Il Pontefice romano e il Congresso delle Potenze per la Pace; IVAN LIABOOKA, L'adommatismo russo e il rinnovellamento religioso del cristianesimo; J. BREITENSTEIN, La santità di Gesù; GIOVANNI LUZZI, La versione Diodatina della Bibbia e i suoi ritocchi.

*Gereformeerd Theologisch Tijdschrift*, Heusden, Maart: V. HEPP, De vorm der N. Testamentische Brieven volgens Deissmann en zijn school; A. G. HONIG, Albrecht Ritschl en Wilhelm Hermann III; J. C. RULLMANN, Kroniek. *The Same*, April: V. HEPP, De vorm der Nieuw-Testamentische Brieven volgens Deissmann en zijn school (ii); G. CH. AALDERS, Maleachi 2:15; J. C. RULLMANN, Kroniek. *The Same*, Mei: J. RIDDERBOS, Farizeesche Heilsverwachting; P. A. E. SILLEVIS SMITT, De Eeredienst in den Apostolischen tijd; J. C. RULLMANN, Kroniek.

*Lehre und Wehre*, St. Louis März: Reden des synoptischen Jesus über sein Erlösungswerk; Verhängnisvolle "Kriegsziele." *The Same*, April: Zur Einigung; Reden des synoptischen Jesus über sein Erlösungswerk. *The Same*, Mai; Zum gegenwärtigen Stand der Kontroverse: Reden des synoptischen Jesus über sein Erlösungswerk.

*Theologisch Tijdschrift*, Leiden, 1:2 en 3: M. WOLFF, Is het Boek Esther Historie of Fictie? K. Vos, Iets over Gods almacht; F. M. TH. BÖHL, Ausgewählte Keilschrifttexte aus Boghaz-Köi; D. HANS WINDISCH, Christuskult und Paulinismus; B. D. EERDMANS, Grondwetsherziening en Openbaar Onderwijs.

*Theologische Studiën*, Utrecht, XXXIV: 1 en 2: TH. L. W. VAN RAVESTEYN, God en Mensch in Babel en Bijbel, (i); F. E. DAUBANTON, Ter inleiding tot de Didaktiek des Nieuwen Verbonds (vi). *The Same*, 3: D. PLOOIJ, Jezus en de oorlog; F. E. DAUBANTON, Ter inleiding tot de Didaktiek des Nieuwen Verbonds (vii); A VAN VELDHUIZEN, Een vertaling van Paulus' len Brief aan de Korinthiers.



Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries



1 1012 01446 0176

*For use in Library only*

For use in Library only

